

FILE nes04int.txt

2004 American National Election Study (2004.T)
Codebook introduction file
VERSION 20050816 (Aug 16, 2005)

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES:

2004 PRE-POST ELECTION STUDY

CODEBOOK

Center for Political Studies
Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan

□

CITATION

The National Election Studies (www.umich.edu/~nes). THE 2004 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY [dataset]. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies [producer and distributor].

These materials are based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant SES-0118451, and the University of Michigan.

Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in these materials are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding organizations.

□ 2004 NES CODEBOOK
 TABLE OF CONTENTS
 =====

The 2004 Codebook comprises 3 files : NES04INT.TXT Introduction [this file]
 NES04VAR.TXT Variable Documentation
 NES04APP.TXT Appendices

Note: sections in the current file can be navigated by searching ">>".

2004 CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION (file "NES04INT.TXT")

>> 2004 General Introduction
>> 2004 Study Description
>> 2004 Study Design, Content and Administration
 >> 2004 Study Design
 >> 2004 Study Content
 >> 2004 Study Administration
>> 2004 Special Note about Texas incumbents
>> 2004 National Election Study Sample Design
 >> Study Population
 >> Multi-Stage Area Probability Design
 >> Sample Design Assumptions, Specifications, and Outcomes
 >> Post-Election Sample Outcomes
 >> Weighted Analysis
 >> Construction of Analysis Weights
 >> Procedures for Sampling Error Estimation
>> 2004 Note on Confidential Materials
>> 2004 File Structure and Processing information
>> 2004 Codebook Information (how to read)
>> 2004 Variable Description List

2004 VARIABLE DOCUMENTATION (file "NES04VAR.TXT")

V040001 - V041214a Identification, Weights, and Study Descriptive
V042001 - V042428 Pre-Election Administrative
V043001 - V043413g Pre-Election Survey
V044001 - V044517d Post-Election Administrative
V045001 - V045308g Post-Election Survey

2004 CODEBOOK APPENDICES (file "NES04APP.TXT")

>> 2004 Census (2000) Combined Statistical Area
 >> 2004 Candidate Number Master Code (House and Senate)
 >> 2004 Type Race Master Code (House and Senate)
 >> 2004 Party-Candidate Master Code ('Likes-Dislikes')
 >> 2004 Religion Master Code
 >> 2004 Census 2000 Occupation Master Code
 >> 2004 Census 2000 Industry Master Code
 >> 2004 Census 1990 Occupation Master Code
 >> 2004 Ethnicity Master Code
 >> 2004 ICSPR State and Country Master Code
 >> 2004 Cities Master Code
 >> 2004 Most Important Problem Master Code

Note: sections in the Appendices file can be navigated by searching ">>". □>> 2004 G

In the fall of 2004 the National Election Studies (NES) carried out a time series study both before and after the 2004 Presidential Election in the United States.

The number of cases in this Full Release file, 1212, includes all respondents from both the pre-election and post-election surveys. Respondents who completed a pre-election survey but not a post-election survey are shown as missing in the post-election survey variables.

Accompanying the dataset is codebook documentation containing detailed variable descriptions, as well as data descriptor statement files that can be used to read the raw data file into common data analysis software packages such as SAS, SPSS, and STATA.

>> 2004 Study Description

The 2004 American National Election Study was conducted by the Center for Political Studies at the Institute for Social Research, under the general direction of the Principal Investigators, Nancy Burns and Donald R. Kinder. Data collection services were provided by the Survey Research Center (SRC) of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research.

This is the latest in a series of studies of American national elections produced by the University of Michigan's Center for Political Studies. The study would not have been possible without the financial support of the National Science Foundation and the University of Michigan (the Center for Political Studies, the Department of Political Science, the Survey Research Center, and the Office of the Provost).

The 2004 National Election Study was designed through consultation between the Principal Investigators, a national Board of Overseers, a specially appointed Planning Committee, and the NES user community.

Board members during the 2004 National Election Study included John H. Aldrich (Duke University), Stephen Ansolabehere (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Nancy Burns, ex officio (University of Michigan), Russell Dalton (University of California - Irvine), John Mark Hansen, chair (University of Chicago), Simon Jackman (Stanford University), Donald Kinder, ex officio (University of Michigan), Jon A. Krosnick (Ohio State University), Arthur Lupia (University of Michigan), Diana C. Mutz (University of Pennsylvania), and Wendy Rahn (University of Minnesota).

Planning Committee members for the 2004 National Election Study included John H. Aldrich (Duke University), Stephen Ansolabehere (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), David W. Brady (Stanford University), Nancy E. Burns (University of Michigan), Raymond Duch (University of Houston), John Mark Hansen (University of Chicago), Simon Jackman (Stanford University), Jon A. Krosnick (Ohio State University), Donald R. Kinder (University of Michigan), Arthur Lupia, chair (University of Michigan), Kathleen McGraw (Ohio State University), Diana C. Mutz (University of Pennsylvania), Wendy Rahn (University of Minnesota), Robert Y. Shapiro (Columbia University), and Daron Shaw (University of Texas).

A stimulus letter was sent to members of the scholarly community and a special website and message board system were set up in order to solicit input on study plans.

Additional information concerning the 2004 NES, including notification of select errors discovered and made known to NES Staff after the data release date, can be found on the NES Website (<http://www.umich.edu/~nes>). Any questions not answered on the website or by this codebook can be directed to the NES Staff by e-mail to "nes@umich.edu" or by regular postal service to the address below.

National Election Studies (NES) Staff
 Center for Political Studies
 Institute for Social Research, 4100 Bay
 University of Michigan
 426 Thompson Street
 Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321
 E-Mail: nes@umich.edu
 Website: <http://www.umich.edu/~nes>

>> 2004 Study Design, Content and Administration

>> 2004 STUDY DESIGN

The 2004 National Election Study entailed both a pre-election interview and a post-election re-interview. A freshly drawn cross section of the electorate was taken to yield 1,212 cases. The 70-minute pre-election survey went into the field September 7th, approximately eight weeks before Election Day. No interviewing was conducted on Election Day, November 2nd. The 65-minute post-election study went into the field the day after the election, November 3rd, and remained in the field until December 20th. Further details of the administration of the surveys are given in "2004 STUDY ADMINISTRATION," below.

>> 2004 STUDY CONTENT

Like its predecessors, the 2004 NES was divided between questions necessary for tracking long-term trends and questions necessary to understand the particular political moment of 2004. The study maintains and extends the NES time-series 'core' by collecting data on Americans' basic political beliefs, allegiances, and behaviors: aspects of political belief and action so basic to the understanding of politics that they must be monitored at every election, no matter the nature of the specific campaign or the broader setting. Core consists of: (1) attachments to the parties; (2) evaluations of incumbents and their challengers; (3) opinions on political issues; (4) ideological identification and political values; (5) general attitudes

toward democratic procedure and the political system; (6) engagement and participation in politics; (7) immersion in mass media; (8) identification with and attitude toward social groups; and (9) social background.

The study also carried topical and study-specific instrumentation. Questions covering issues prominent in 2004 addressed job outsourcing, private investment of Social Security funds, and President Bush's tax cut. Americans' views on foreign policy, the war on terrorism, and the Iraq War and its consequences were also addressed. In addition, the study carried expanded instrumentation on inflation, immigration, gender politics, and gay and lesbian politics. It also extended the experiment on the measurement of voter turnout that began in 2002. A special feature was the incorporation of the module on representation and accountability, Module 2, from the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES), at the end of the Post-election interview.

Finally, a mergeable ancillary file of contextual data is an additional component of the 2004 election study. The file, available by the summer of 2005, contains 435 records representing all House districts. It includes biographical information, district and state descriptive variables, and other data related to the 2004 election and its candidates.

>> 2004 STUDY ADMINISTRATION

The pre-election survey began on September 7th, 2004 and ended November 1st, 2004. No interviewing was conducted on Election Day, November 2nd. The post-election reinterviews began on November 3rd, 2004 and ended December 20th, 2004.

Data collection was conducted by the Survey Research Center (SRC) of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. All interviewing was conducted face-to-face using Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) technology. The CAPI instrument was programmed using Blaise, a software package developed by Statistics Netherland. All interviews were conducted in English, as there were no translations of the questionnaire to a language other than English.

The pre-election study sample was released all at once at the beginning of the field period. All individuals who completed a pre-election interview were contacted to be interviewed again in the post-election study. The post-election design was managed as a "quick take," with as many completions gained as close to Election Day as possible.

For interview proper (defined as the portion of the interview after the front end, but prior to the interviewer observations), the pre-election study ran approximately 70 minutes per interview, and the post-election study approximately 65 minutes per interview. Both studies made use of respondent booklets, and the post-election study also made use of ballot cards. Randomization was used extensively throughout both the pre-election and post-election questionnaires, for purposes of randomizing order within batteries or question series, application of half-sampling to some questions, and random ordering of question blocks.

The sample for the 2004 study was comprised of 2,374 cases, a freshly drawn cross section intended to be nationally representative of the electorate. All respondents were United States citizens aged 18 years or older by election Day (November 2nd, 2004).

Users are advised to become familiar with the weight variables provided in the dataset, and apply them as appropriate to their analyses to correct for

non-response and other sampling issues.

Final disposition codes for each case were provided by the data collection organization, coded to categories identified in the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Standards and Best Practices guide. The citation for the AAPOR document is:

The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2000.
Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. Ann Arbor, Michigan: AAPOR.

Cases were divided into eligible and non-eligible categories, where unknown eligibility was grouped with eligible cases. All interviews were fully completed, with no partial interviews accepted. Eligible (or unknown eligibility) cases that did not provide an interview were categorized as non-response. The sample of 2,374 cases yielded 1,833 cases that were considered eligible. Of special note among these are cases representing households with no person available who spoke English, and for which no multi-lingual interviewer was available to determine eligibility. Such cases were categorized as eligible non-response, since eligibility was uncertain. Regardless, an interview could not have been conducted for these cases because the 2004 questionnaire was only available in English. The sample yielded 1,212 pre-election interviews and 622 non-response cases (429 of which were refusals). 1,066 pre-election respondents went on to also provide a post-election interview (146 non-response in the Post, including 91 refusals).

2004 Election Study Response Rates

	Interviews	Eligible	Response Rate
Pre-Election	1212	1833	66.1%
Post-Election	1066	1212	88.0%

The Pre-Election response rate of 66.1% is calculated as the total number of Pre-Election interviews over the total number of eligible (and unknown eligibility) cases in the sample. The Post-Election response rate of 88.0% is a re-interview rate, calculated as the total number of Post-Election Interviews over the total number of Pre-Election Interviews. (Note: these response rates are unweighted. Double samples and other such techniques were not employed in the 2004 study.)

The field and study staff implemented a number of strategies throughout the study to bolster response rates.

1) In the pre-election study:

Households were sent advance mailings by first class mail in a stamped 9.5 by 13.5 inch padded manila envelope, with a hand-signed letter, a brochure, a \$5 bill, and a University of Michigan refrigerator magnet enclosed. A respondent incentive of \$20 per interview was initially offered to all cases. Households were contacted and screened face-to-face.

Cases that showed resistance to interview were usually mailed a letter tailored to their reason for resistance. A refusal conversion attempt was then made.

Near the end of the pre-election study, on October 20th, a two-day UPS mailing containing a hand-signed letter was sent to all outstanding sample lines that did not have a hard appointment set; the letter offered an

increased incentive of \$50 per interview.

2) In the post-election study:

Respondents received an advance hand-signed letter by first class mail in a stamped 9.5 by 13.5 inch padded manila envelope. As an incentive for their post-election interview, respondents were offered the same dollar amount as they received in the pre-election study, and respondents were paid by the interviewer at the time of the interview. During the first two weeks of the post-election study, interviewers were allowed to contact households by telephone in order to set up an appointment to interview at a convenient time, although all interviewing was conducted face-to-face.

As in the pre-election study, cases that showed resistance to interview were usually mailed a letter tailored to their reason for resistance. A refusal conversion attempt was then made.

3) Interviewer incentives:

Throughout both the pre-election and post-election study a number of interviewer and team leader incentive strategies were implemented, including monetary incentives for meeting management goals at different junctures during the study period.

>> 2004 Special note about Texas House Incumbents

Names of candidates were preloaded into the post-election survey instrument following identification of the respondent's Congressional district. (District identification was supplied by Marketing Systems group in combination with staff research.)

In general, candidates are identified as House incumbents in this file to establish the context of pre-existing association with the respondent. Incumbents are thus regarded as candidates that are (already) in office in representation of a district at the time of the 2004 election, where district is regarded as a geographic location rather than a political unit. The extent of Texas redistricting from 108th to 109th Congressional district boundaries consistently produced 2004 House races with incumbent candidates running to represent areas where he or she had provided little or no previous representation. Consequently, no Texas candidate has been identified as a (true)incumbent for any 109th Congressional district, as neither the running nor retiring incumbent for the district. All Texas Congressional races have been considered open races, all Texas candidates have been given candidate codes corresponding to nonincumbent candidates, and retiring Texas House incumbents were not associated with any new district as the retiree.

>> 2004 National Election Study Sample Design

>> STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 2004 National Election Study (NES) is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 2004 Election Day. Eligible citizens must have resided in housing units in the forty-eight coterminous states. This definition excludes persons living in Alaska or Hawaii and requires eligible persons to have been both a United

States citizen and eighteen years of age on or before the 2nd of November 2004.

>> MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY DESIGN

The area sample is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) 1990 National Sample design. Identification of the 2004 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four stage sampling process: a primary stage sampling of U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) or New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs) and non-MSA counties, followed by a second stage sampling of area segments, a third stage sampling of housing units within sampled area segments and concluding with the random selection of a single respondent from selected housing units. A detailed documentation of the 1990 SRC National Sample, from which the 2004 NES sample was drawn, is provided in the SRC publication titled 1990 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

The 2004 NES sample design called for an entirely new cross-section sample to be drawn from the 1990 SRC National Sample. The 1990 SRC National Sample is a multi-stage area probability sample. The 2004 NES sample was drawn from both the 1990 SRC National Sample strata (MSA PSUs) and the 1980 SRC National Sample strata (non-MSA PSUs). The modification of the 1990 design in which the 1980 strata definitions were used for the non-MSA counties fully represents the non-MSA domain of the 48 contiguous states. This modification was made for cost and interviewing efficiency reasons related to the availability of interviewers in these areas who work on some of SRC's large panel studies. The following sections will focus on the 1990 SRC National Sample design.

Selection Stages for the 2004 NES Sample: 1990 SRC National Sample

- Primary Stage Selection

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSUs) for the 1990 SRC National Sample, which depending on the sample stratum are either MSAs, New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs), single counties, independent cities, county equivalents or groupings of small counties, is based on the county level 1990 Census Reports of Population and Housing[1]. Primary stage units were assigned to 108 explicit strata based on MSA/NECMA or nonMSA/NECMA status, PSU size, Census Region and geographic location within region. Twenty-eight of the 108 strata contain only a single selfrepresenting PSU, each of which is included with certainty in the primary stage of sample selection. The remaining 80 non-selfrepresenting strata contain more than one PSU. From each of these nonselfrepresenting strata, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1990 occupied housing units.

The full 1990 SRC National Sample of 108 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly three to five times the size of the 2004 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSUs such as a one-half sample or a three-quarter sample partition. Each of the partitions represents a stratified sub-selection from the full 108 PSU design. The 2004 NES sample of 44 PSUs is a stratified random subsample of PSUs from the "A" half-sample partition of the 1990 SRC National Sample. Because of the small size of this NES sample, both the number of PSUs (selected primary areas) and the secondary stage units (area segments) in the National half-sample were reduced by sub-selection for the 2004 NES sample design. The 18 self-representing areas in the 1990 SRC National half-sample were all

retained for the 2004 NES sample (8 of these remained self-representing in the 2004 NES and 10 represent not only their own MSA but their "pair" among the twenty additional self-representing primary areas of the full 1990 SRC National Sample design). Nineteen of the 26 nonself-representing half-sample MSAs and 7 of the 14 half-sample non-MSAs were retained by the sub-selection for the 2004 NES sample (or 26 of 40 NSR PSUs).

- Second Stage Selection of Area Segments

The second stage of the 1990 SRC National Sample, used for the 2004 NES sample, was selected directly from computerized files that were extracted for the selected PSUs from the 1990 U.S. Census summary file series STF1-B. These files (on CD Rom) contain the 1990 Census total population and housing unit (HU) data at the census block level. The designated second stage sampling units (SSUs), termed "area segments", are comprised of census blocks in both the metropolitan (MSA) primary areas and in the rural areas of non-MSA primary areas. Each SSU block or block combination was assigned a measure of size equal to the total 1990 occupied housing unit count for the area. SSU block(s) were assigned a minimum measure of 72 total HUs per MSA SSU and a minimum measure of 48 total HUs per non-MSA SSU. Second stage sampling of area segments was performed with probabilities proportionate to the assigned measures of size (PPS).

For the 2004 NES sample the number of area segments used in each PSU varies. In the self-representing (SR) PSUs the number of area segments varies in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 12 area segments to a low of 6 area segments.

For the 2004 NES sample the number of area segments used in each PSU varies. In the self-representing (SR) PSUs the number of area segments varies in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 12 area segments to a low of 6 area segments in smaller self-representing PSUs [2].

- Third Stage Selection of Housing Units: 2004 NES Sample

For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing had been made of all housing units located within the physical boundaries of the segment. For segments with a very large number of expected housing units, all housing units in a sub-selected part of the segment were listed. The final equal probability sample of housing units for the 2004 NES sample was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The 2004 NES sample design was selected from the 1990 SRC National Sample to yield an equal probability sample of 2,756 listed housing units. This total included 2,366 housing units for the main sample and three reserve replicates of 130 cases each. Table A below shows the assumptions that were used to determine the number of sample housing units. The overall probability of selection for 2004 NES cross-section sample of households was $f=0.00002575$ or 0.2575 in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the 2004 NES sample by using the standard multistage sampling technique of setting the sampling rate for selecting housing units within area segments to be inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities used to select the PSU and area segment (Kish, 1965).

- Fourth Stage Respondent Selection: 2004 NES Sample

Within each sampled 2004 NES occupied housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. A single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of

circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent.

>> SAMPLE DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OUTCOMES

The 2004 National Election Study sought a total of 1200 in-person interviews. It was estimated that this would require a NES sample draw of 2,366 housing units. This assumed an occupancy/growth rate of 0.83, an eligibility rate of 0.94 and a response rate of 0.65. These assumptions were based on the 2000 NES field experience. The overall 2004 NES area sample design specifications, assumptions and outcomes appear in Table A, below. A sample of 2,756 listed housing units was actually selected for the 2004 NES study. This allowed for three reserve replicates of 130 cases each. Use of half-open intervals in the field led to the addition of 8 additional lines. These were housing units that were not identified during the listing stage, but were located between the selected housing unit and the next unit on the original listing. The use of this procedure insures full coverage of housing units.

A comparison of the 2004 NES sample outcome figures to the design specifications and assumptions in table A below shows that the actual occupancy, eligibility, and response rates were very close to the expected rates.

Table A.
2004 NES Area Sample Pre and Post-Election Design Specifications
and Assumptions Compared to Sample Outcome.

	2004 NES Pre Design Specification	2004 NES Pre Sample Outcome	2004 NES Post Design Specification	2004 NES Post Sample Outcome
	-----	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL SAMPLE LINES	2366	2374		
Completed Interviews	1200	1212	1020	1066
Eligible Sample HHs	1946	1825	1200	1212
Occupied Households	1964	1886		
Response Rate	.65	.66	.85	.88
Eligibility Rate	.94	.97		
Occupancy/growth rate	.83	.79		

>> POST-ELECTION SAMPLE OUTCOMES

Of the 1,212 respondents interviewed in the Pre-Election Study, 1,066 completed Post-Election interviews for an overall response rate of 0.88.

>> WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF THE 2004 NES DATA

The 2004 NES data set includes a person-level analysis weight, which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors. Analysts interested in developing their own nonresponse or stratification adjustment factors must request access to the necessary sample control data from the NES Board.

>> CONSTRUCTION OF ANALYSIS WEIGHTS

Household Selection Weight Component

Each household selected for the 2004 NES had an equal probability of

selection. The inverse of this probability results in an inflation factor of 38,832.4 for each household in the sample.

Person-Level Sample Selection Weight Component

Within sample households a single adult respondent is chosen at random to be interviewed. Since the number of eligible adults varies from one household to another, the random selection of a single adult introduces inequality into respondents' selection probabilities. In analysis, a respondent selection weight should be used to compensate for these unequal selection probabilities. The person-level selection weight is the product of the household selection weight and the within household selection weight. The within household selection weight is equal to the number of eligible persons in the household and is capped at 3. The use of the respondent selection weight is strongly encouraged, despite past evaluations that have shown these weights to have little significant impact on the values of NES estimates of descriptive statistics.

Nonresponse Adjusted Selection Weight

The base weight equals the product of the selection weight and the household level nonresponse adjustment factors. Nonresponse adjustment cells for the 2004 NES sample were formed by crossing MSA status by the four Census regions. A nonresponse adjustment factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases. Table B below shows the response rates and nonresponse adjustment factors for the 2004 NES.

Table B.
Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights
2004 NES Area Sample.

PSU TYPE	CENSUS REGION	RESPONSE RATE	NONRESP. ADJUSTMENT FACTOR
MSAs	Northeast	56.18	1.78
	Midwest	69.96	1.43
	South	65.86	1.52
	West	68.50	1.46
Non-MSAs	Northeast	66.44	1.51
	Midwest	77.08	1.30
	South	68.57	1.46
	West	65.64	1.52

Post-stratification factor

The 2004 NES weights are post-stratified to 2004 CPS March Supplement proportions for six (6) ages by four (4) education categories. Table C shows the weighted estimates and proportions for the 24 cells for the 2004 CPS and the 2004 NES. The post-stratification adjustment is computed by dividing the CPS weighted total by the 2004 NES total weighted by the nonresponse adjusted selection weight. The final two columns show the NES weighted totals using the final post-stratified analysis weight and the resulting percents, which match the CPS percents.

Final Analysis Weights

The final analysis weight is the product of the household level non-response

adjustment factor, the number of eligible persons, and a person-level post-stratification factor. The final analysis weight for the 2004 NES sample is scaled to sum to 1212, the total number of respondents. This weight is trimmed at the 1st and 99th percentiles and then re-scaled to match the 2004 CPS proportions for the 24 age-by-education cells.

Post-Election Attrition Weight

The 1,066 Post-Election cases were post-stratified to 2004 CPS March Supplement proportions for six (6) ages by four (4) education categories (the same categories used for post-stratifying the Pre-Election cases). The post-stratification compensates for differential non-response by age group and education level. Response rates for the Post-Election Study ranged from a high of 100 percent for persons 70 or older with some college to a low of 58 percent for persons age 30 - 39 who did not graduate from high school. The panel attrition weight for the Post-Election Study is the product of the Pre-Election final weight and the post-stratification factor formed by dividing the CPS proportion by the weighted NES proportion for each of the 24 age by education cells. The weight is scaled to sum to the number of cases, 1,066.

Table C.
2004 NES Sample Weight: Post-stratification Factors

AGE GROUP	EDUCATION LEVEL	N	2004 CPS	2004	PRELIM	POST-	NES	FINAL
			Est. in 000s[3]	CPS %	2004 NES WTD. EST IN 000s	STRAT ADJ.	WTD N CTRD	NES WTD. %
18-29	< High School Grad	17	6246.8	3.183	2107.7	2.964	38.58	3.183
	High School Grad	74	12310.9	6.274	10089.9	1.220	76.04	6.274
	Some College	97	15337.3	7.816	12556.4	1.221	94.73	7.816
	College Grad	53	6950.8	3.542	6275.0	1.108	42.93	3.542
30-39	< High School Grad	12	2844.8	1.450	1432.3	1.986	17.57	1.450
	High School Grad	45	10866.0	5.537	5309.0	2.047	67.11	5.537
	Some College	72	10391.4	5.296	8536.8	1.217	64.18	5.296
	College Grad	69	11277.4	5.747	8168.7	1.381	69.95	5.747
40-49	< High School Grad	15	3654.2	1.862	1751.5	2.086	22.57	1.862
	High School Grad	66	13453.9	6.856	7767.5	1.732	83.10	6.856
	Some College	80	11737.5	5.982	9572.5	1.226	72.50	5.982
	College Grad	78	12124.4	6.179	8616.0	1.407	74.89	6.179
50-69	< High School Grad	12	3183.4	1.622	1634.8	1.947	19.66	1.622
	High School Grad	67	10523.7	5.363	8438.9	1.247	65.00	5.363
	Some College	70	9437.2	4.809	9110.4	1.036	58.29	4.809
	College Grad	82	10571.3	5.387	9854.1	1.073	65.29	5.387
60-69	< High School Grad	21	3589.4	1.829	1972.7	1.820	22.17	1.829
	High School Grad	63	7807.9	3.979	7258.0	1.076	48.23	3.979
	Some College	36	4727.6	2.409	4367.0	1.083	29.20	2.409
	College Grad	52	5009.8	2.553	6766.7	0.740	30.94	2.553
70+	< High School Grad	22	6801.0	3.466	1975.7	3.442	42.01	3.466
	High School Grad	52	8761.4	4.465	5598.5	1.565	54.11	4.465
	Some College	29	4309.9	2.196	3072.6	1.403	26.62	2.197
	College Grad	28	4311.5	2.197	3243.8	1.329	26.63	2.192
----- TOTALS		1212	196229.7	100%	145476.6	100%	1212	100%

>> PROCEDURES FOR SAMPLING ERROR ESTIMATION

The 2004 NES sample design is based on a stratified multi-stage area

probability sample of United States households. Although smaller in scale, the NES sample design is very similar in its basic structure to the multi-stage designs used for major federal survey programs such as the Health Interview Survey (HIS) or the Current Population Survey (CPS). The survey literature refers to the NES, HIS and CPS samples as complex designs, a loosely-used term meant to denote the fact that the sample incorporates special design features such as stratification, clustering and differential selection probabilities (i.e., weighting) that analysts must consider in computing sampling errors for sample estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. This section of the 2004 NES sample design description focuses on sampling error estimation and construction of confidence intervals for survey estimates of descriptive statistics such as means, proportions, ratios, and coefficients for linear and logistic linear regression models.

Standard analysis procedures in software systems such as SAS and SPSS assume simple random sampling (SRS) or equivalently independence of observations in computing standard errors for sample estimates. In general, the SRS assumption results in underestimation of variances of survey estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. Confidence intervals based on computed variances that assume independence of observations will be biased (generally too narrow) and design-based inferences will be affected accordingly.

Sampling Error Computation Methods and Programs

Over the past 50 years, advances in survey sampling theory have guided the development of a number of methods for correctly estimating variances from complex sample data sets. A number of sampling error programs which implement these complex sample variance estimation methods are available to NES data analysts. The two most common approaches to the estimation of sampling error for complex sample data are through the use of a Taylor Series Linearization of the estimator (and corresponding approximation to its variance) or through the use of resampling variance estimation procedures such as Balanced Repeated Replication (BRR) or Jackknife Repeated Replication (JRR). New Bootstrap methods for variance estimation can also be included among the resampling approaches. See Rao and Wu (1988).

1. Taylor series linearization method:

When survey data are collected using a complex sample design with unequal size clusters, most statistics of interest will not be simple linear functions of the observed data. The linearization approach applies Taylor's method to derive an approximate form of the estimator that is linear in statistics for which variances and covariances can be directly and easily estimated (Woodruff, 1971). SUDAAN and Stata are two commercially available statistical software packages that include procedures that apply the Taylor series method to estimation and inference for complex sample data. SAS has also recently added procedures that make use of the Taylor series linearization method.

SUDAAN (Research Triangle Institute, 2001) is a commercially available software system developed and marketed by the Research Triangle Institute of Research Triangle Park, North Carolina (USA). SUDAAN was developed as a stand-alone software system with capabilities for the more important methods for descriptive and multivariate analysis of survey data, including: estimation and inference for means, proportions and rates (PROC DESCRIPT and PROC RATIO); contingency table analysis (PROC CROSSTAB); linear regression (PROC REGRESS); logistic regression (PROC LOGISTIC); log-linear models (PROC LOGLINK); and survival analysis (PROC SURVIVAL). The latest versions of

SUDAAN permit procedures to be called directly from the SAS system. Information on SUDAAN is available at the following web site address: <http://www.rti.org>.

Stata (StataCorp, 2003) is another commercially available software system for analysis of complex sample survey data and has a growing body of research users. Stata includes special versions of its standard analysis routines that are designed for the analysis of complex sample survey data. Special survey analysis programs are available for descriptive estimation of means (SVYMEAN), ratios (SVYRATIO), proportions (SVYPROP) and population totals (SVYTOTAL). Stata programs for multivariate analysis of survey data currently include linear regression (SVYREGRESS), logistic regression (SVYLOGIT) and probit regression (SVYPROBT). Information on the Stata analysis software system can be found on the Web at: <http://www.stata.com>.

SAS versions 8 and higher have added several procedures for the analysis of survey data. Programs for the estimation of means (PROC SURVEYMEANS) and linear regression models (PROC SURVEYREG) have been included in the STAT module. Other procedures planned for version 9 include procedures for estimating totals and proportions (PROC SURVEYFREQ) and for logistic regression models (PROC SURVEYLOGISTIC).

2. Resampling methods:

BRR, JRR and the bootstrap comprise a second class of nonparametric methods for conducting estimation and inference from complex sample data. As suggested by the generic label for this class of methods, BRR, JRR and the bootstrap utilize replicated subsampling of the sample database to develop sampling variance estimates for linear and nonlinear statistics. WesVar (Brick et al., 2002) is a commercially available software system for personal computers that employs replicated variance estimation methods to conduct the more common types of statistical analysis of complex sample survey data. WesVar was developed by Westat, Inc. Information about WesVar is available from Westat's Web site: <http://www.westat.com/>. WesVar includes a Windows-based application generator that enables the analyst to select the form of data input (SAS data file, SPSS for Windows data base, dBase file, ASCII data set) and the computation method (BRR or JRR methods). Analysis programs contained in WesVar provide the capability for basic descriptive (means, proportions, totals, cross tabulations) and regression (linear, logistic) analysis of complex sample survey data.

These new and updated software packages include an expanded set of user friendly, well-documented analysis procedures. Difficulties with sample design specification, data preparation, and data input in the earlier generations of survey analysis software created a barrier to use by analysts who were not survey design specialists. The new software enables the user to input data and output results in a variety of common formats, and the latest versions accommodate direct input of data files from the major analysis software systems. Readers who are interested in a more detailed comparison of these and other survey analysis software alternatives are referred to Cohen (1997).

Sampling Error Computation Models

Regardless of whether linearization or a resampling approach is used, estimation of variances for complex sample survey estimates requires the specification of a sampling error computation model. NES data analysts who are interested in performing sampling error computations should be aware that the estimation programs identified in the preceding section assume a specific sampling error computation model and will require special sampling

error codes. Individual records in the analysis data set must be assigned sampling error codes that identify to the programs the complex structure of the sample (stratification, clustering) and are compatible with the computation algorithms of the various programs. To facilitate the computation of sampling error for statistics based on 2004 NES data, design-specific sampling error codes will be routinely included in all public-use versions of the data set. Although minor recoding may be required to conform to the input requirements of the individual programs, the sampling error codes that are provided should enable analysts to conduct either Taylor Series or Replicated estimation of sampling errors for survey statistics.

Two sampling error code variables are defined for each case based on the sample design primary stage unit (PSU) and area segment in which the sample household is located.

Sampling Error Stratum Code

The Sampling Error Computation Stratum Code (digit 1 of V040103) is the variable that defines the sampling error computation strata for all sampling error analysis of the NES data. Each self-representing (SR) design stratum is represented by one sampling error computation stratum. Pairs of similar nonself-representing (NSR) primary stage design strata are "collapsed" (Kalton, 1977) to create NSR sampling error computation strata. Since there was an uneven number of nonself-representing MSA and non-MSA strata used in the 2004 NES, and since it was felt that a nonself-representing MSA PSU should be paired with a non-MSA PSU, one of each of these PSUs stands alone within its Sampling Error Stratum Code.

For the 1990 SRC National Sample design, controlled selection and a "one-per-stratum" PSU allocation are used to select the primary stage of the 2004 NES national sample. The purpose in using controlled selection and the "one-per-stratum" sample allocation is to reduce the between-PSU component of sampling variation relative to a "two-per-stratum" primary stage design. Despite the expected improvement in sample precision, a drawback of the "one-per-stratum" design is that two or more sample selection strata must be collapsed or combined to form a sampling error computation stratum. Variances are then estimated under the assumption that a multiple PSU per stratum design was actually used for primary stage selection. The expected consequence of collapsing design strata into sampling error computation strata is the overestimation of the true sampling error; that is, the sampling error computation model will yield estimates of sampling errors which in expectation will be slightly greater than the true sampling error of the statistic of interest.

SECU - Stratum-specific Sampling Error Computation Unit code (last 2 digits of V040103) is a half sample code for analysis of sampling error using the BRR method or approximate "two-per-stratum" Taylor Series method (Kish and Hess, 1959). Within the SR sampling error strata, the SECU half sample units are created by dividing sample cases into random halves, SECU=1 and SECU=2. The assignment of cases to half-samples is designed to preserve the stratification and second stage clustering properties of the sample within an SR stratum. Sample cases are assigned to SECU half samples based on the area segment in which they were selected. For this assignment, sample cases were placed in original stratification order (area segment number order) and beginning with a random start entire area segment clusters were systematically assigned to either SECU=1 or SECU=2.

In the general case of nonself-representing (NSR) strata, the half sample units are defined according to the PSU to which the respondent was assigned

at sample selection (with the exception of the two unpaired NSR strata mentioned above). That is, the half samples for each NSR sampling error computation stratum bear a one-to-one correspondence to the sample design NSR PSUs. The particular sample coding provided on the NES public use data set is consistent with the "ultimate cluster" approach to complex sample variance estimation (Kish, 1965; Kalton, 1977). Individual stratum, PSU and segment code variables may be needed by NES analysts interested in components of variance analysis or estimation of hierarchical models in which PSU-level and neighborhood-level effects are explicitly estimated.

References

- Alegria, M., Kessler, R., Bijl, R., Lin, E., Heeringa, S.G., Takeuchi, D.T., Kolody, B. (2000). To appear in *The Unmet Need for Treatment. Proceedings of a Symposium of the World Psychiatric Association, Sydney, Australia, October, 1997.*
- Binder, D.A. (1983), "On the variances of asymptotically normal estimators from complex surveys," *International Statistical Review*, Vol. 51, pp. 279-292.
- Brick, J.M., et.al. (2002). "WesVar 4.2 User's Guide." Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.
- Cochran, W.G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cohen, S.B. (1997). "An evaluation of alternative PC-based software packages developed for the analysis of complex survey data," *The American Statistician*, Vol. 51, No. 3, pp. 285-292.
- Goldstein, H. (1987). *Multi-level Models in Educational and Social Research*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kalton, G. (1977), "Practical methods for estimating survey sampling errors," *Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute*, Vol. 47, 3, pp. 495-514.
- Kish, L. (1949). "A procedure for objective respondent selection within the household," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 44, pp. 380-387.
- Kish, L. (1965), *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kish, L., & Frankel, M.R. (1974), "Inference from complex samples," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, B*, Vol. 36, pp. 1-37.
- Kish, L., Groves, R.M., & Krotki, K.P. (1975). "Sampling errors for fertility surveys." Occasional Paper No. 17. Voorburg, Netherlands: World Fertility Survey, International Statistical Institute.
- Kish, L., & Hess, I. (1959), "On variances of ratios and their differences in multi-stage samples," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 54, pp. 416-446.
- LePage, R., & Billard, L. (1992), *Exploring the Limits of Bootstrap*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Mahalanobis, P.C. (1946), "Recent experiments in statistical sampling at the

Indian Statistical Institute," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 109, pp. 325-378.

McCullagh, P.M. & Nelder, J.A. (1989). *Generalized Linear Models*, 2nd Edition. Chapman and Hall. London.

Rao, J.N.K & Wu, C.F.J. (1988.), "Resampling inference with complex sample data," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83, pp. 231-239.

Rosenstone, Steven J., Kinder, Donald R., Miller, Warren E., & the National Election Studies Sample Design: Technical Memoranda, 1994 Election Study pp. 882-905 in Rosenstone, Steven J., Kinder, Donald R., Miller, Warren E., & the National Election Studies, *AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1994: ELECTION SURVEY (ENHANCED WITH 1992 AND 1993 DATA)* (Computer file). Conducted by University of Michigan Center for Political Studies. 2nd ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies, and Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (producer), 1995. Ann Arbor MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributor), 1995.

Research Triangle Institute (2001). *SUDAAN User's Manual*, Release 8.0. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Rust, K. (1985). "Variance estimation for complex estimators in sample surveys," *Journal of Official Statistics*, Vol. 1, No. 4.

SAS Institute, Inc. (2004). *SAS/STAT User's Guide*, Version 9.1, Vol. 1-9. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.

Skinner, C.J., Holt, D., & Smith, T.M.F. (1989). *Analysis of Complex Surveys*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

SPSS, Inc. (2003). *SPSS 12.0 Base User's Guide*. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

StataCorp. (2003). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 8.0*. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.

Wolter, K.M. (1985). *Introduction to Variance Estimation*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Woodruff, R.S. (1971), "A simple method for approximating the variance of a complicated estimate," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 66, pp. 411-414.

Yamaguchi, K. (1991). *Event History Analysis*. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. 28. Newbury Park, CA/London: Sage Publications.

.....

Footnotes

- [1] Office of Management and Budget (OMB) June 1990 definitions of MSAs, NECMAs, counties, parishes, independent cities. These, of course, differ in some respects from the primary stage unit (PSU) definitions used in the 1980 SRC National Sample so will not be strictly comparable to the 1996 NES Panel PSUs--particularly in New England where MSAs were used as PSUs in the 1980 National Sample and NECMAs were used as PSUs in

the 1990 National Sample.

- [2] One selected segment was in a former trailer park that had no housing units to be listed in January 1996. All had been destroyed in 1992 by hurricane Andrew and there were no plans to rebuild.
- [3] Because U.S. citizenship is required for NES eligibility, the CPS counts used for stratification include only U.S. citizens.

>> 2004 Note on Confidential Materials

Starting with the 1986 Election Study, NES has released occupation code variables in less detail than preceding years. The full release of this dataset includes a two-digit code with 25 categories corresponding to 2000 Census Bureau occupational groupings. Those who need the full occupation code for their research should contact the NES project staff for information about the conditions under which access may be provided.

The National Election Studies have also not included information for census tracts or minor civil divisions since 1978, and since 2000 county and PSU identification have no longer been made available. Permission to use detailed geographic information for scholarly research may be obtained from the Board of Overseers. More information about this is available from NES project staff.

Note that coding of the full religious denomination variable is in some cases based on alphabetic "other, please specify" variables, which are restricted for reasons of confidentiality, although access may be provided to legitimate scholars under established NES procedures.

Finally, the National Election Studies have traditionally contained several minutes of open-ended responses (for example, the candidate likes and dislikes). These questions are coded by the SRC coding section according to master code schemes. Other scholars have developed alternative or supplemental coding schemes for such questions (for example, the levels of conceptualization, released as ICPSR 8151). The Board of Overseers wishes to encourage these efforts but in ways which respect the NES and SRC obligation to protect the privacy and anonymity of respondents. Circumstances under which individuals may have access to transcribed versions of these questions have been worked out and those interested should contact the NES project staff for further details.

>> 2004 File Structure and Processing Information

The data file for the 2004 American National Election Study is constructed with a single logical record for each respondent. Records are in comma-delimited ASCII format with variable names comprising the first data line.

The data collection was processed according to standard processing procedures. The data were checked for inconsistent code values which, when found, were corrected or recoded to missing data values. Consistency checks were performed. Annotation was added by the processors for explanatory purposes.

□>> 2004 CODEBOOK INFORMATION (how to read)

EXAMPLE OF CODEBOOK VARIABLE DOCUMENTATION

```

01 =====
02 V035246      Q9a. Party of Pres vote -party performance past 4 yrs
03 =====
04
05 IF R VOTED:
06 IF R VOTED FOR PRESIDENT:
07 IF PRESIDENTIAL VOTE WAS FOR MAJOR PARTY CANDIDATE/
08 IF PRESIDENTIAL VOTE WAS FOR OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE:
09
10 QUESTION:
11 -----
12 You've indicated that you voted for the [>NAME OF MAJOR PARTY<
13 Presidential candidate/Presidential candidate from the >NAME
14 OF OTHER PARTY< party] in 2004.
15 How well has [the >NAME OF MAJOR PARTY< party/ that party] performed
16 over the past four years? Has it done a VERY GOOD job? a GOOD job?
17 A BAD job? A VERY BAD job? (in general)
18
19 INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION:
20 -----
21 {INTERVIEWER: DO NOT PROBE DON'T KNOW}
22
23 VALID CODES:
24 -----
25 1. Very good job
26 2. Good job
27 3. Bad job
28 4. Very bad job
29
30 MISSING CODES:
31 -----
32 8. Don't know
33 9. Refused
34 INAP. 5,8,9 in C1a or 1-3,8,9 in C1b; 5,8,9 in C6; 7,8,9 in
35 Q9x; no post IW
36
37 NOTES:
38 -----
39 Text corresponding to C6a party of vote for President was
40 included in the question text.
41
42 TYPE:
43 -----
44 Numeric Dec 0
45

```

.....
NOTE: THIS EXAMPLE DOES NOT REPRESENT AN ACTUAL NES VARIABLE

LINE 02

Contains identifiers, including (left to right) the variable name, the question "tag" or item number (Q9a), and the variable label. Since the variable label begins with the question tag, the question tag only appears

once, as part of the variable label.

LINES 05-08

This describes who is being asked the question, inverse to the INAP conditions (lines 34-35). Each line ending with ":" describes one condition that has been met to reach this question.

"/" at the end of a line is equivalent to an "OR" between the condition preceding and the condition following the "/". In this example, respondents who were asked this question were respondents who 1) said they voted, and who 2) said they voted specifically for President, and who 3) voted for a major party Presidential candidate OR for another party's candidate. Note that a corresponding "/" sometimes appears in the question text when question wording varies according to which of the OR conditions applies. See lines 12-17.

LINES 12-17

Several conventions are observed in codebook presentation of question text.

- 1) Text bracketed between ">" and "<" (line 12, line 15) indicates that case-specific text was loaded onto the instrument by the survey application.
In this example, ">NAME OF MAJOR PARTY<" indicates that either "Democratic" or "Republican" was loaded into the question text, depending up which major party candidate R indicated he had voted for earlier in the questionnaire
- 2) Text bracketed between "[" and "]" (lines 12-14; line 15) displays text options, separated by "/". In this example, the first option is for Rs who had voted for a major party candidate; the first 2 sentences read to these respondent are:
"You've indicated that you voted for the >NAME OF MAJOR PARTY< Presidential candidate in 2004. How well has the >NAME OF MAJOR PARTY< party performed over the past four years?"
On the other hand, in this example, if R voted for another party's candidate, the first 2 sentences are:
"You've indicated that you voted for the >NAME OF OTHER PARTY< party in 2004. How well has that party performed over the past four years?"
- 3) Text in parentheses (line 17) is read at the interviewer's discretion.
- 4) Text in CAPS, other than text bracketed with ">" "<" per 1), indicates words or phrases that appeared underlined in the instrument for emphasis. In this example (lines 16-17), the words "very good", "good", "bad", and "very bad" had appeared underlined for interviewer emphasis..

LINE 21

With few exceptions, interviewer instructions appear in the instrument immediately following the question text.

LINES 34-35

INAP describes the specific paths of all respondents whom the instrument skips over the question. Each condition which results in a skip is listed, separated by ";". □>> 2004 Variable Description List

Variable	Description
STUDY IDS	
VERSION	Study.1. Dataset version
DSETID	Study.1. Dataset ID number

V040001 Study.3. 2004 Pre Case ID
 V040002 Study.4. 2004 Post Case ID

STUDY WEIGHTS AND SAMPLING ERROR CODE

V040101 Study.5. Pre-election post-stratified sample weight
 V040102 Study.6. Post-election post-stratified sample weight
 V040103 Study.7. Sampling error code

STUDY DESCRIPTIVE

V041001 Study.8. Pre only or pre and post interviews
 V041101 HHListing.1. HH listing summary: number of persons in HH
 V041102 HHListing.2. HH listing summary: number of adults in HH
 V041102a HHListing.2a. HH listing summary: no. eligible adults in HH
 V041102b HHListing.2b. HH listing summary:no. ineligible adults in HH
 V041102c HHListing.2c. HH listing summary: no. female adults in HH
 V041103 HHListing.3. HH listing summary: number of children in HH
 V041104 HHListing.4. HH listing summary: no. female children in HH
 V041105 HHListing.5. HH listing summary: no. children under 5 in HH
 V041106 HHListing.6. HH listing summary: no. children age 5-9 in HH
 V041107 HHListing.7. HH listing summary:no. children age 10-13 in HH
 V041108 HHListing.8. HH listing summary:no. children age 14-17 in HH
 V041109 HHListing.9. Respondent person number in HH listing
 V041109a HHListing.9a. Respondent gender
 V041109b HHListing.9b. Respondent relationship to informant
 V041109c HHListing.9c. Respondent's number of children in HH
 V041109d HHListing.9d. Respondent's number of female children in HH
 V041110 HHListing.10. Household composition
 V041111a HHListing.11a. 1st HH adult - age
 V041111b HHListing.11b. 1st HH adult - gender
 V041112a HHListing.12a. 2nd HH adult age
 V041112b HHListing.12b. 2nd HH adult gender
 V041113a HHListing.13a. 3rd HH adult age
 V041113b HHListing.13b. 3rd HH adult gender
 V041114a HHListing.14a. 4th HH adult age
 V041114b HHListing.14b. 4th HH adult gender
 V041115a HHListing.15a. 5th HH adult age
 V041115b HHListing.15c. 5th HH adult gender
 V041116a HHListing.16a. 6th HH adult age
 V041116b HHListing.16b. 6th HH adult gender
 V041201 Sampling.1. State name
 V041201a Sampling.1a. Postal abbreviation of state
 V041202 Sampling.2. FIPS state code
 V041203 Sampling.3. ICPSR state code
 V041204 Sampling.4. Congressional District number
 V041204a Sampling.4a. State postal abbrev and Congr district number
 V041204b Sampling.4b. State FIPS code and Congr district number
 V041204c Sampling.4c. State ICPSR code and Congr district number
 V041205 Sampling.5. Census region
 V041206 Sampling.6. Primary area (PSU) number
 V041206a Sampling.6a. PSU name
 V041207 Sampling.7. Segment number
 V041207a Sampling.7a. Segment name
 V041208 Sampling.8. FIPS state-county code
 V041208a Sampling.8a. FIPS county name
 V041209 Sampling.9. Census tract
 V041210 Sampling.10. Census Place code
 V041211 Sampling.11. Census Minor Civil Division (MCD)
 V041212 Sampling.12. Census MSA 1990

V041213 Sampling.13. Census Urban/Rural classification
V041214 Sampling.14. Census CSA 2000
V041214a Sampling.14a. Census CBSA

PRE-ELECTION FIELD AND ADMINISTRATION

V042001 PreAdmin.1. Form of interview
V042002 PreAdmin.2. Pre IW beginning month
V042003 PreAdmin.3. Pre IW beginning day
V042004 PreAdmin.4. Pre IW beginning date MMDD
V042005 PreAdmin.5. Pre IW beginning version of instrument
V042006 PreAdmin.6. Pre IW ending month
V042007 PreAdmin.7. Pre IW ending day
V042008 PreAdmin.8. Pre IW ending date MMDD
V042009 PreAdmin.9. Pre IW ending version of instrument
V042010a PreAdmin.10a. No. days before election beginning IW date
V042010b PreAdmin.10b. No. days before election ending IW date
V042011 PreAdmin.11. Total number of Pre interview sessions
V042012 PreAdmin.12. Pre instrument version changed before IW end
V042013 PreAdmin.13. Total number of Pre interviewers
V042014a PreAdmin.14a. Pre IW session 1 date MMDD
V042014b PreAdmin.14b. Pre IW session 2 date MMDD
V042014c PreAdmin.14c. Pre IW session 3 date MMDD
V042014d PreAdmin.14d. Pre IW session 4 date MMDD
V042015a PreAdmin.15a. Pre IW session 1 version of instrument
V042015b PreAdmin.15b. Pre IW session 2 version of instrument
V042015c PreAdmin.15c. Pre IW session 3 version of instrument
V042015d PreAdmin.15d. Pre IW session 4 version of instrument
V042016a PreAdmin.16a. Pre IW session 1 breakoff/end
V042016b PreAdmin.16b. Pre IW session 2 breakoff/end
V042016c PreAdmin.16c. Pre IW session 3 breakoff/end
V042017 PreAdmin.17. Total number of calls
V042018 PreAdmin.18. Number of FTF calls
V042019 PreAdmin.19. Number of phone calls
V042020 PreAdmin.20. Interviewer interview number (nth IW)
V042021 PreAdmin.21. Refusal conversion indicator
V042022 PreAdmin.22. Release
V042023 PreAdmin.23. Mode of interview
V042024 PreAdmin.24. Result
V042025 PreAdmin.25. Length of interview
V042026 PreAdmin.26. Language of interview
V042027 PreAdmin.27. Interview verification
V042028 PreAdmin.28. Interviewer evaluation
V042029 PreAdmin.29. Interview tape-recorded
V042030 PreAdmin.30. Payment offer amount
V042031 PreAdmin.31. Payment amount
V042032 PreAdmin.32. Payment date
V042033 PreAdmin.33. Payment mode
V042034 PreAdmin.34 Respondent incentive
V042035 PreAdmin.35. Persuasion letters
V042036a PreAdmin.36x1a. Summary: R made positive comment
V042036b PreAdmin.36x1b. Summary: R made time-delay comment
V042036c PreAdmin.36x1c. Summary: R made negative comment
V042036d PreAdmin.36x1d. Summary: R made eligibility comment
V042036e PreAdmin.36x1e. Summary: R made privacy comment
V042036f PreAdmin.36x1f. Summary: R made comment no int in politics
V042037a PreAdmin.37a. Comment: positive - help community
V042037b PreAdmin.37b. Comment: positive - enjoy surveys
V042037c PreAdmin.37c. Comment: other positive
V042037d PreAdmin.37d. Comment: time delay - too busy

V042037e PreAdmin.37e. Comment: time delay - bad time
 V042037f PreAdmin.37f. Comment: time delay - think about it
 V042037g PreAdmin.37g. Comment: other time delay
 V042037h PreAdmin.37h. Comment: negative - waste of time
 V042037j PreAdmin.37j. Comment: negative - don't trust surveys
 V042037k PreAdmin.37k. Comment: negative - surveys waste money
 V042037m PreAdmin.37m. Comment: negative - never do surveys
 V042037n PreAdmin.37n. Comment: negative - not interested
 V042037p PreAdmin.37p. Comment: other negative
 V042037q PreAdmin.37q. Comment: eligibility -don't know about topic
 V042037r PreAdmin.37r. Comment: eligibility - no spouse/partn/child
 V042037s PreAdmin.37s. Comment: eligibility - too young/too old
 V042037t PreAdmin.37t. Comment: eligibility - don't/can't vote
 V042037u PreAdmin.37u. Comment: other eligibility
 V042037v PreAdmin.37v. Comment: privacy - personal questions
 V042037w PreAdmin.37w. Comment: privacy - govt knows everything
 V042037y PreAdmin.37y. Comment: other privacy
 V042038 PreAdmin.38. Respondent initial refusal
 V042039 PreAdmin.39. Informant initial refusal
 V042040 PreAdmin.40. Type of structure
 V042041 PreAdmin.41. Structure description
 V042042 PreAdmin.42. Structure residential status
 V042043 PreAdmin.43. Observed urbanicity of segment
 V042044 PreAdmin.44. Political signs
 V042044a PreAdmin.44a. Type political sign 1
 V042044b PreAdmin.44b. Type political sign 2
 V042045x PreAdmin.45x. Summary: any specified impediment noted
 V042045a PreAdmin.45a. Structure impediment - locked entrance
 V042045b PreAdmin.45b. Structure impediment - locked gates
 V042045c PreAdmin.45c. Structure impediment - gatekeeper
 V042045d PreAdmin.45d. Structure impediment - intercom
 V042046x PreAdmin.46x. Summary: any specified security measure
 V042046a PreAdmin.46a. Structure security - bars
 V042046b PreAdmin.46b. Structure security - crime watch/sec system
 V042046c PreAdmin.46c. Structure security - no trespassing sign
 V042046d PreAdmin.46d. Structure security - security door
 V042046e PreAdmin.46e. Structure security - guard dogs
 V042047 PreAdmin.47. Gatekeeper present
 V042047a PreAdmin.47a. Type gatekeeper
 V042048a PreAdmin.48a. Summary: gatekeeper status
 V042048b PreAdmin.48b. Summary: locked status

PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEWER DESCRIPTION

V042101 PreIwr.1. Interviewer of record ID
 V042101a PreIwr.1a. Other interviewer ID
 V042102 PreIwr.2. Supervisor ID
 V042103 PreIwr.3. Interviewer gender
 V042104 PreIwr.4. Interviewer education level
 V042105 PreIwr.5. Interviewer race
 V042106 PreIwr.6. Interviewer ethnicity
 V042107 PreIwr.7. Interviewer languages
 V042108 PreIwr.8. Interviewer experience
 V042109 PreIwr.9. Interviewer age group

PRE-ELECTION ERROR FLAGS

V042201 PreErr.1. Pre interview error flag
 V042202 PreErr.2. Pre interview error flag

PRE-ELECTION RANDOMIZATION

V042401 PreRand.1. Random order Pres cand A3-A6 Likes-Dislikes
 V042402 PreRand.2. Random order Pres cand B1b-B1c thermometers
 V042403a PreRand.3a. Random order B1d Cheney thermometer
 V042403b PreRand.3b. Random order B1e John Edwards thermometer
 V042403c PreRand.3c. Random order B1f Laura Bush thermometer
 V042403d PreRand.3d. Random order B1g Hillary Clinton thermometer
 V042403e PreRand.3e. Random order B1h Bill Clinton thermometer
 V042403f PreRand.3f. Random order B1j Colin Powell thermometer
 V042403g PreRand.3g. Random order B1k John Ashcroft thermometer
 V042403h PreRand.3h. Random order B1m John McCain thermometer
 V042404 PreRand.4. Random order parties B1n-B1p thermometers
 V042405 PreRand.5. Random order parties C1-C2 Likes-Dislikes
 V042406 PreRand.6. Random order Pres cand D1-D2 affects
 V042407a PreRand.7a. Random order D1a Bush angry affect
 V042407b PreRand.7b. Random order D1b Bush hopeful affect
 V042407c PreRand.7c. Random order D1c Bush afraid affect
 V042407d PreRand.7d. Random order D1d Bush proud affect
 V042408a PreRand.8a. Random order D2a Kerry angry affect
 V042408b PreRand.8b. Random order D2b Kerry hopeful affect
 V042408c PreRand.8c. Random order D2c Kerry afraid affect
 V042408d PreRand.8d. Random order D2d Kerry proud affect
 V042409 PreRand.9. Random order Pres cand E3-E4 liberal-conservative
 V042410 PreRand.10. Random order parties E5-E6 liberal-conservative
 V042411 PreRand.11. Random order F3-F6 unemployment or inflation
 V042412 PreRand.12. Random order names G1-G3 party performance
 V042413 PreRand.13. Random order Pres cand K1-K2 traits
 V042414a PreRand.14a. Random order K1a Bush moral trait
 V042414b PreRand.14b. Random order K1b Bush leadership trait
 V042414c PreRand.14c. Random order K1c Bush cares trait
 V042414d PreRand.14d. Random order K1d Bush knowledgeable trait
 V042414e PreRand.14e. Random order K1e Bush intelligent trait
 V042414f PreRand.14f. Random order K1f Bush dishonest trait
 V042414g PreRand.14g. Random order K1g Bush make up mind trait
 V042415a PreRand.15a. Random order K1a Kerry moral trait
 V042415b PreRand.15b. Random order K1b Kerry leadership trait
 V042415c PreRand.15c. Random order K1c Kerry cares trait
 V042415d PreRand.15d. Random order K1d Kerry knowledgeable trait
 V042415e PreRand.15e. Random order K1e Kerry intelligent trait
 V042415f PreRand.15f. Random order K1f Kerry dishonest trait
 V042415g PreRand.15g. Random order K1g Kerry make up mind trait
 V042416 PreRand.16. Random order Pres cand N1b-c spending-services
 V042417 PreRand.17. Random order parties N1d-e spending-services
 V042418 PreRand.18. Random order Pres cand N2b-c defense spending
 V042419 PreRand.19. Random order parties N2d-e defense spending
 V042420 PreRand.20. Random order Pres cand N5b-c guaranteed jobs
 V042421 PreRand.21. Random order parties N5d-e guaranteed jobs
 V042422 PreRand.22. Random order Pres cand N6b-c aid to blacks
 V042423 PreRand.23. Random order parties N6d-e aid to blacks
 V042424a PreRand.24a. Random order P1b Social Security Fed. spending
 V042424b PreRand.24b. Random order P1c public schools Fed. spending
 V042424c PreRand.24c. Random order P1d science/tech Fed. spending
 V042424d PreRand.24d. Random order P1e prevent crime Fed. spending
 V042424e PreRand.24e. Random order P1f welfare Fed. spending
 V042424f PreRand.24f. Random order P1g child care Fed. spending
 V042424g PreRand.24g. Random order P1h foreign aid Fed. spending
 V042424h PreRand.24h. Random order P1j aid to poor Fed. spending
 V042424j PreRand.24j. Random order P1k illegal immigr Fed. spending

V042424k PreRand.24k. Random order Plm war on terror Fed. spending
 V042425 PreRand.25. Random order Pres candd P3b-c environment/jobs
 V042426 PreRand.26. Random order Pres candd P5b-c gun control
 V042427 PreRand.27. Random order Pres candd P6b-c women's role
 V042428 PreRand.28. Random order parties P6d-e women's role

PRE-ELECTION SURVEY

V043001 A1. Interested in following campaigns?
 V043002 A1a. Did R vote 2000?
 V043003 A1a1. Recall of last President vote choice
 V043004 A2. Was 2000 Pres election fair or unfair
 V043005 A2a. How strongly feels 2000 Pres election was fair/unfair
 V043006 A3a. Is there anything R likes about GW Bush
 V043007 A3b. Summary: No. Mentions - Likes About GW Bush
 V043007a A3b1. What does R like about GW Bush MENTION 1
 V043007b A3b2. What does R like about GW Bush MENTION 2
 V043007c A3b3. What does R like about GW Bush MENTION 3
 V043007d A3b4. What does R like about GW Bush MENTION 4
 V043007e A3b5. What does R like about GW Bush MENTION 5
 V043008 A4a. Is there anything R dislikes about GW Bush
 V043009 A4b. Summary: No. Mentions - Dislikes About GW Bush
 V043009a A4b1. What does R dislike about GW Bush MENTION 1
 V043009b A4b2. What does R dislike about GW Bush MENTION 2
 V043009c A4b3. What does R dislike about GW Bush MENTION 3
 V043009d A4b4. What does R dislike about GW Bush MENTION 4
 V043009e A4b5. What does R dislike about GW Bush MENTION 5
 V043010 A5a. Is there anything R likes about Kerry
 V043011 A5b. Summary: No. Mentions - Likes About John Kerry
 V043011a A5b1. What does R like about John Kerry MENTION 1
 V043011b A5b2. What does R like about John Kerry MENTION 2
 V043011c A5b3. What does R like about John Kerry MENTION 3
 V043011d A5b4. What does R like about John Kerry MENTION 4
 V043011e A5b5. What does R like about John Kerry MENTION 5
 V043012 A6a. Is there anything R dislikes about Kerry
 V043013 A6b. Summary: No. Mentions - Dislikes About John Kerry
 V043013a A6b1. What does R dislike about John Kerry MENTION 1
 V043013b A6b2. What does R dislike about John Kerry MENTION 2
 V043013c A6b3. What does R dislike about John Kerry MENTION 3
 V043013d A6b4. What does R dislike about John Kerry MENTION 4
 V043013e A6b5. What does R dislike about John Kerry MENTION 5
 V043014 A7. Days past week watch natl news on TV
 V043015 A7a. Attention to national (network) news
 V043016 A8a. Days past week watch local TV news late aft/early eve
 V043017 A8b. Days past week watch local news on TV in the late eve
 V043018 A8c. Attention to local news
 V043019 A9. How many days past week read a daily newspaper?
 V043020 A9(1). How many days past week read a daily online newsp
 V043021 A9a. Did R read about campaign in newspaper?
 V043022 A9a1. Attention to newspaper articles
 V043023 A10. Are things in the country on right track
 V043024 A10a. Presidential approval: general job handling
 V043025 A10a1. Presidential approval: general job handling strength
 V043026 A10b. Approval of Presidents handling of economy
 V043027 A10b1. Strength approve/disappr President handling of econ
 V043028 A10c. Approval of President handling foreign relations
 V043029 A10c1. Strength approve/disappr Pres handling foreign rel
 V043030 A10d. Approve Bush handling budget deficit
 V043031 A10d1. Strength approve/disappr Bush handling budget defct
 V043032 A10e. Approve Bush handling war on terror

V043033 A10e1. Strength approve/disappr Bush handling war on terr
 V043034 A11. Are things in the country on right track
 V043034x A11x. SUMMARY: A10/A11 country on right track
 V043035 A12. Care who wins House election
 V043036 A13. Approval of Congress handling its job
 V043037 A13a. Strength appr/disapprove Congress handling its job
 V043038 B1a. Feeling Thermometer: GW Bush
 V043039 B1b. Feeling Thermometer: John Kerry
 V043040 B1c. Feeling Thermometer: Nader
 V043041 B1d. Feeling Thermometer: Cheney
 V043042 B1e. Feeling Thermometer: John Edwards
 V043043 B1f. Feeling Thermometer: Laura Bush
 V043044 B1g. Feeling Thermometer: Hillary Clinton
 V043045 B1h. Feeling Thermometer: Bill Clinton
 V043046 B1j. Feeling Thermometer: Colin Powell
 V043047 B1k. Feeling Thermometer: John Ashcroft
 V043048 B1m. Feeling Thermometer: John McCain
 V043049 B1n. Feeling Thermometer: Democratic party
 V043050 B1p. Feeling Thermometer: Republican party
 V043051 B1q. Feeling Thermometer: Ronald Reagan
 V043052 C1a. Is there anything R likes about Democratic Party
 V043053 C1b. Summary: No. Mentions - Likes About Democratic Party
 V043053a C1b1. What does R like about Democratic Party MENTION 1
 V043053b C1b2. What does R like about Democratic Party MENTION 2
 V043053c C1b3. What does R like about Democratic Party MENTION 3
 V043053d C1b4. What does R like about Democratic Party MENTION 4
 V043053e C1b5. What does R like about Democratic Party MENTION 5
 V043054 C1c. Is there anything R dislikes about Democratic Party
 V043055 C1d. Summary: No. Mentions - Dislikes About Democratic Party
 V043055a C1d1. What does R dislike about Democratic Party MENTION 1
 V043055b C1d2. What does R dislike about Democratic Party MENTION 2
 V043055c C1d3. What does R dislike about Democratic Party MENTION 3
 V043055d C1d4. What does R dislike about Democratic Party MENTION 4
 V043055e C1d5. What does R dislike about Democratic Party MENTION 5
 V043056 C2a. Is there anything R likes about Republican Party
 V043057 C2b. Summary: No. Mentions - Likes About Republican Party
 V043057a C2b1. What does R like about Republican Party MENTION 1
 V043057b C2b2. What does R like about Republican Party MENTION 2
 V043057c C2b3. What does R like about Republican Party MENTION 3
 V043057d C2b4. What does R like about Republican Party MENTION 4
 V043057e C2b5. What does R like about Republican Party MENTION 5
 V043058 C2c. Is there anything R dislikes about Republican Party
 V043059 C2d. Summary: No. Mentions - Dislikes About Republican Party
 V043059a C2d1. What does R dislike about Republican Party MENTION 1
 V043059b C2d2. What does R dislike about Republican Party MENTION 2
 V043059c C2d3. What does R dislike about Republican Party MENTION 3
 V043059d C2d4. What does R dislike about Republican Party MENTION 4
 V043059e C2d5. What does R dislike about Republican Party MENTION 5
 V043060 C3. Better when one party controls presidency and Congress
 V043061 C4. R better/worse off than 1 year ago
 V043062 C4a. R how much better/worse off than 1 year ago
 V043063 C5. Will R be financially better/worse off year from now
 V043064 C5a. R how much better/worse off 1 year from now
 V043065 C6. Does R/spouse have any money invested in stock market
 V043066 C7. Did R put off medical treatment R could not afford
 V043067 C8. Can R afford needed health care
 V043068 C9. Does R have health insurance
 V043069 D1a. Affect for GW Bush: angry
 V043070 D1a1. How often GW Bush: angry
 V043071 D1b. Affect for GW Bush: hopeful

V043072 D1b1. How often GW Bush: hopeful
 V043073 D1c. Affect for GW Bush: afraid
 V043074 D1c1. How often GW Bush: afraid
 V043075 D1d. Affect for GW Bush: proud
 V043076 D1d1. How often GW Bush: proud
 V043077 D2a. Affect for Kerry: angry
 V043078 D2a1. How often Kerry: angry
 V043079 D2b. Affect for Kerry: hopeful
 V043080 D2b1. How often Kerry: hopeful
 V043081 D2c. Affect for Kerry: afraid
 V043082 D2c1. How often Kerry: afraid
 V043083 D2d. Affect for Kerry: proud
 V043084 D2d1. How often Kerry: proud
 V043085 E1a. Liberal/conservative self-placement -7-point scale
 V043085a E1b. If R had to choose liberal or conservative self-place
 V043086 E1x. SUMMARY: R self-placement liberal-conservative
 V043087 E2. Liberal/conservative Placement - GW Bush
 V043088 E3. Liberal/conservative Placement - Kerry
 V043089 E4. Liberal/conservative Placement - Nader
 V043090 E5. Liberal/conservative Placement - Dem Party
 V043091 E6. Liberal/conservative Placement - Rep party
 V043092 E7. Care who wins Presidential Election
 V043093 E8. Who does R think will be elected President?
 V043094 E8a. Will Pres race be close or will (winner) win by a lot
 V043095 E9. Which Pres cand will carry state
 V043096 E9a. Will Pres race be close in state
 V043097 F1. National economy better/worse in last year
 V043098 F1a. How much economy better/worse in last year
 V043099 F2. Will national economy be better or worse in next 12 mo
 V043100 F2a. How much economy better or worse in next 12 months
 V043101 F3. Unemployment better or worse in last year
 V043102 F3a. How much unemployment better or worse in last year
 V043103 F4. R think there more or less unemployment in next year
 V043104 F5. Inflation better or worse in last year
 V043105 F5a. Inflation much or somewhat better/worse in last year
 V043106 F6. Inflation in next year
 V043107 F7a. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: self-placement
 V043108 F7a1. Importance of diplomacy issue to R
 V043109 G1. Which party better: handling nations economy
 V043110 G2. Which party better: handle war on terrorism
 V043111 G3. Which party better: handle keeping out of war
 V043112 H1. During last year, U.S. position in world weaker/strong
 V043113 H2. Country would be better off if we just stayed home
 V043114 J1. Party ID: R think of self as Dem, Rep, Ind or what
 V043114a J1a. Party Identification Democrat/Republican-strong/not
 V043115 J1b. No Party Identification-closer democrat or republican
 V043116 J1x. Summary: R party ID
 V043117 K1a. Traits for GW Bush: Moral
 V043118 K1b. Traits for GW Bush: Provides strong leadership
 V043119 K1c. Traits for GW Bush: really cares
 V043120 K1d. Traits for GW Bush: knowledgeable
 V043121 K1e. Traits for GW Bush: intelligent
 V043122 K1f. Traits for GW Bush: dishonest
 V043123 K1g. Traits for GW Bush: can't make up own mind
 V043124 K2a. Traits for Kerry: Moral
 V043125 K2b. Traits for Kerry: provides strong leadership
 V043126 K2c. Traits for Kerry: really cares about people like you
 V043127 K2d. Traits for Kerry: knowledgeable
 V043128 K2e. Traits for Kerry: intelligent
 V043129 K2f. Traits for Kerry: dishonest

V043130 K2g. Traits for Kerry: can't make up mind
 V043131 M1a. War in Afghanistan worth the cost
 V043132 M2a. Approve Bush handling of war in Iraq
 V043133 M2a1. How much approve/disapprove Bush handling Iraq war
 V043134 M3. Was Iraq war worth the cost
 V043135 M4. Iraq war increased or decreased threat of terrorism
 V043136 N1a. Spending and Services - 7-point scale self-placement
 V043137 N1a1. Importance of spending/services issue to R
 V043138 N1b. Spending and Services Placement: GW Bush
 V043139 N1c. Spending and Services Placement: Kerry
 V043140 N1d. Spending and Services Placement: Dem party
 V043141 N1e. Spending and Services Placement: Rep party
 V043142 N2a. Defense spending - 7-point scale self-placement
 V043143 N2a1. Importance of defense spending issue to R
 V043144 N2b. Defense spending scale: GW Bush placement
 V043145 N2c. Defense spending scale: Kerry placement
 V043146 N2d. Defense spending scale: Dem party placement
 V043147 N2e. Defense spending scale: Rep party placement
 V043148 N3. Does R favor/oppose tax cuts Pres. Bush initiated
 V043149 N3a. How strongly R favors/opposes the Pres Bush tax cuts
 V043150 N4a. Govt/private medical insurance scale: self-placement
 V043151 N4a1. Importance of govt health insurance issue to R
 V043152 N5a. Job and Good Standard of Living -scale self-placement
 V043153 N5a1. Importance of guaranteed jobs/standard living issue
 V043154 N5b. Job and Good Standard of Living - GW Bush placement
 V043155 N5c. Job and Good Standard of Living - Kerry placement
 V043156 N5d. Job and Good Standard of Living - Dem party placement
 V043157 N5e. Job and Good Standard of Living - Rep party placement
 V043158 N6a. Government assistance to blacks-7 point scale self-pl
 V043159 N6a1. Importance of aid to blacks issue to R
 V043160 N6b. Aid to blacks Placement: GW Bush
 V043161 N6c. Aid to blacks Placement: Kerry
 V043162 N6d. Aid to blacks Placement: Dem party
 V043163 N6e. Aid to blacks Placement: Rep party
 V043164 P1a. Federal Budget Spending: building/repairing highways
 V043165 P1b. Federal Budget Spending: Social Security
 V043166 P1c. Federal Budget Spending: public schools
 V043167 P1d. Federal Budget Spending: science and technology
 V043168 P1e. Federal Budget Spending: dealing with crime
 V043169 P1f. Federal Budget Spending: welfare programs
 V043170 P1g. Federal Budget Spending: child care
 V043171 P1h. Federal Budget Spending: foreign aid
 V043172 P1j. Federal Budget Spending: aid to the poor
 V043173 P1k. Fed Budget Spending: border sec to prevent illeg imm
 V043174 P1m. Federal Budget Spending: war on terrorism
 V043175 P2a. Does R think pays right amount of taxes
 V043176 P2a1. Do rich pay right amount of taxes
 V043177 P2a2. Do poor pay right amount of taxes
 V043178 P2b. Favor govt funds to pay for abortions
 V043179 P2b1. Strength favor/oppose govt funds to pay for abortion
 V043180 P2c. Favor/oppose ban on late-term/partial-birth abortions
 V043181 P2c1. Strength favor/oppose ban on partial-birth abortions
 V043182 P3a. Environment vs. jobs tradeoff scale - self-placement
 V043183 P3a1. Importance of environment/jobs issue to R
 V043184 P3b. Environment vs. jobs tradeoff scale - GW Bush placemt
 V043185 P3c. Environment vs. jobs tradeoff scale - Kerry placement
 V043186 P4. R favor/oppose death penalty
 V043187 P4a. Strength R favors/opposes death penalty
 V043188 P5a. Should fed govt make more difficult to buy gun - self
 V043189 P5a1. How much easier/harder to buy gun - self-placement

V043190 P5a2. Importance of gun access issue to R
 V043191 P5b. Easier or harder to buy gun - GW Bush
 V043192 P5b1. How much easier or harder to buy gun - GW Bush
 V043193 P5c. Easier or harder to buy gun - Kerry
 V043194 P5c1. How much easier or harder to buy gun - Kerry
 V043195 P5d. Does R have a gun in his or her home or garage?
 V043196 P6a. Women's role - 7-point scale self-placement
 V043197 P6a1. How important is the issue of women's equal role
 V043198 P6b. Women's role - GW Bush placement
 V043199 P6c. Women's role - Kerry placement
 V043200 P6d. Women's role - Dem party placement
 V043201 P6e. Women's role - Rep party placement
 V043202 Q1. Does R think will vote this November
 V043203 Q1a. Who does R think will/would vote for President
 V043204 Q1a1. Strength of pref for Pres cand R will/would vote for
 V043205 Q2a. How good does seeing US flag make R feel
 V043206 Q2b. Things about America that make R ashamed
 V043207 Q2c. Things about America that make R angry
 V043208 Q2d. How strong is love for country
 V043209 Q2e. How important is being an American
 V043210 R1. R position on gay marriage
 V043211 S2. Have taxes increased or decreased under GW Bush
 V043212 S2a. How much taxes increased or decreased under GW Bush
 V043213 S3. National economy better/worse since GW Bush took ofc
 V043214 S3a. How much national economy better/worse last 4 years
 V043215 S4. Has current admin made U.S. more/less secure
 V043216 S4a. How much more/less secure has admin made US
 V043217 S5. Has US moral climate gotten better/worse since 2000
 V043218 S5a. How much better/worse is moral climate since 2000
 V043219 W1. Is religion important part of R life?
 V043220 W2. Religion provides some guidance in day-to-day living
 V043221 W3. How often does R pray
 V043222 W4. Bible is word of God or men
 V043223 X1. Ever attend church/religious services?
 V043224 X1a. Attend religious services how often
 V043225 X1a1. Attend church more often than once a week?
 V043226 X2. Active at church besides attendance
 V043227 X2a. Active at church - meeting
 V043228 X2b. Active at church - speech
 V043229 X3. Ever think of self as part of church or denomination?
 V043230a X3a. (Attends) R major religious group
 V043230b X3b. (Nonattendance) R major religious group
 V043231 X4. Major relig denomination
 V043232 X4a. Specific Baptist denomination
 V043233 X4a1. Specific indep. Baptist denomination
 V043234 X4b. Specific Lutheran denomination
 V043235 X4c. Specific Methodist denomination
 V043236 X4d. Specific Presbyterian denomination
 V043237 X4e. Specific Reformed denomination
 V043238 X4f. Specific Brethren denomination
 V043239 X4g. Specific denomination for Just Christian
 V043240 X4h. Specific Church of Christ denomination
 V043241 X4j. Specific Church of God denomination
 V043242 X4k. Specific Holiness/Pentecostal denomination
 V043243 X5a. Specific other denomination
 V043244 X5b. Specific other denomination Christian?
 V043245a X6a. (Attends) Specific Jewish denomination
 V043245b X6b. (Nonattendance) Specific Jewish denomination
 V043246 X7x. Other specify text - all denominations X4a-X6b
 V043247 X8x1. SUMMARY: RESPONDENT MAJOR RELIGIOUS GROUP

V043247a X8x1a. SUMMARY: RESPONDENT MAJOR DENOMINATION
 V043248 X8x2. SUMMARY: RESPONDENT RELIGION FULL
 V043249a Y1a. Birth date Year
 V043249b Y1b. Birthdates Month
 V043250 Y1x. Summary: Respondent age
 V043251 Y2. Marital status
 V043251x Y2x. SUMMARY Marital status
 V043252 Y3. Highest grade of school or year of college R completed
 V043253a Y3a. Did R get high school diploma
 V043253b Y3b. Highest degree R has earned
 V043254 Y3x. Summary: Respondent education level
 V043255 Y4. Spouse: highest grade or year of college
 V043256a Y4a. Did spouse get high school diploma
 V043256b Y4b. Highest degree spouse has earned
 V043257 Y4x. Summary: Spouse/partner education level
 V043258 Y5a. R military service
 V043259 Y5b. Family member military service
 V043260a Y6(1). Employment summary: R employmt status 2-digit full
 V043260b Y6(2). Employment summary: R employment status 1-digit
 V043260c Y6c. Respondent initial employment status
 V043261 Y6x. Occupation in stacked variables Y6x1-Y6x7
 V043262a Y6x1. STACKED: R past/current occupation 3 digit
 V043262b Y6x2. STACKED: R past/current occupation 2 digit
 V043262c Y6x3. STACKED: Collapsed past/current occup prestige score"
 V043262d Y6x4. STACKED: R past/current occupation prestige score
 V043262e Y6x5. STACKED: Industry of R past/current occupation
 V043262f Y6x6. STACKED: R past/current occ work(ed) for self
 V043262g Y6x7. STACKED: R past/current occ work(ed) for govt
 V043262h Y6x8. STACKED: R recent/current occ hours work(ed)
 V043262j Y6x9. STACKED: R worried about losing/finding job
 V043262k Y6x10. STACKED: R had job in last 6 months
 V043263 Y7. Current/past employment information
 V043264 Y7a. Initial status Homemaker/student: also working now?
 V043265 Y7b. Initial status Homemaker/student: job in last 6 month
 V043266a Y8a. Initial status retiree - when retired Year
 V043266b Y8b. Initial status retiree - when retired Month
 V043267 Y9. Initial status unempl/disabled - R ever work for pay
 V043268 Y10a. Initial status ret/dis/unemp/hmkr/stud - past occ 3
 V043268a Y10b1. Initial status ret/dis/unemp/hmkr/stud - past occ 2
 V043268b Y10b2. Init status ret/dis/unemp/hmkr/stu prestige collapsed
 V043268c Y10b3. Init status ret/dis/unem/hkr/stu -past occ prestige
 V043268d Y10b4. Init status ret/dis/unemp/hmkr/stu occup 1990 3-digit
 V043268e Y10b5. Init status ret/dis/unemp/hmkr/stu occup 1990 71-catg
 V043268f Y10b6. Init status ret/dis/unemp/hmkr/stu occup 1990 14-catg
 V043269 Y10c. Init status ret/dis/unem/hkr/stu -past occ industry
 V043270 Y10d. Init status ret/dis/unem/hkr/stu -past occ self-empl
 V043271 Y10e. Init status ret/dis/unem/hkr/stu -past occ govt work
 V043272 Y11a. Initial status unemp/ret/dis - job in last 6 months
 V043273 Y12. Recent occupation: how many hours worked average
 V043274 Y13a. Initial status retired/disabled: also working now?
 V043275 Y14. Init status ret/dis/unemp/hmkr/stud: looking for wk?
 V043276 Y15. Init status ret/dis/unemp/hkr/stu: worried finding wk
 V043277 Y16. Summary: ret/dis/unemp/hkr/stu also working now?
 V043278 Y16a. Working/TLO now occupation 3 digit
 V043278a Y16b. Working/TLO now occupation 2 digit
 V043278b Y16b2. Init status ret/dis/unemp/hmkr/stu prestige collapsed
 V043278c Y16d. Prestige score of working/TLO now occupation
 V043278d Y16b4. Init status working/TLO now occup 1990 3-digit
 V043278e Y16b5. Init status working/TLO now occup 1990 71-categ
 V043278f Y16b6. Init status working/TLO now occup 1990 14-categ

V043279 Y16c. Working/TLO - industry
 V043280 Y16d. Working/TLO now - work for self
 V043281 Y16e. Working/TLO now - work for govt
 V043282 Y16f. Working/TLO now - how many hours works
 V043283 Y16g. Working/TLO now - hours R works satisfactory
 V043284 Y16h. Working/TLO now: worried abt losing job near future
 V043285 Y16j. Working now: out of work or laid off last 6 mos
 V043286 Y16k. Working now: had reduction in work hours or pay
 V043287 Y17a. Working now/TLO: presentation at job in last 6 mos
 V043288 Y17b. Working now/TLO: plan/chair meetg at job last 6 mos
 V043289 Y18a1. Spouse/partner working status 1
 V043289a Y18a2. Spouse/partner working status 2
 V043290 Y19. Anyone in HH belong to labor union?
 V043291 Y19a. Who in HH belongs to union
 V043292 Y20. INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT- PERSONS IN HH AGE 14 OR OLDER
 V043292x Y20x. Summary: no. persons aged 14 and older
 V043293 Y21a. R not only HH member age 14+: Household income
 V043293x Y21a. Summary: Household income
 V043294 Y21b. Respondent income
 V043295 Y22. Think of self as belonging to class?
 V043296 Y22a. Subjective Social Class: Working or Middle
 V043297 Y22b. Subjective Social Class: had to choose wkng/Middle
 V043298 Y23. Summary: subjective social class
 V043299 Y24x. SUMMARY: Race of Respondent
 V043299a Y24a. Race of Respondent MENTION 1
 V043299b Y24b. Race of Respondent MENTION 2
 V043300 Y25. Both parents born in U.S.?
 V043301a Y26a. Main ethnic or nationality group mention 1
 V043301b Y26b. Main ethnic or nationality group mention 2
 V043301c Y26c. Main ethnic or nationality group mention 3
 V043302 Y27. Interviewer CKPT: number of ethnic mentions
 V043303 Y27a. Ethnic group most close
 V043303x Y27ax. Summary: ethnic group
 V043304x Y28x. Did R mention Hispanic group?
 V043305 Y28a. Is R of Hispanic descent
 V043306 Y29. Spanish or Hispanic descent - type
 V043307 Y30. Where R grew up
 V043308 Y31x. Summary: How long lived in this community
 V043309a Y33a. Where R lived previously - state/country
 V043309b Y33b. Where R lived previously - city
 V043310 Y34. Distance where R used to live
 V043311 Y32x. Summary: How long lived in current home
 V043312 Y35. Does R family own/rent home

PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION

V043401a ZZ1a. PRE IWR obs: others present - children under 6
 V043401b ZZ1b. PRE IWR obs: others present - older children
 V043401c ZZ1c. PRE IWR obs: others present - spouse
 V043401d ZZ1d. PRE IWR obs: others present - other relatives
 V043401e ZZ1e. PRE IWR obs: others present - other adults
 V043401f ZZ1f. PRE IWR obs: others present - someone, not sure who
 V043402 ZZ2. PRE IWR OBS: R cooperation
 V043403 ZZ3. PRE IWR OBS: R level of information
 V043404 ZZ4. PRE IWR OBS: R intelligence
 V043405 ZZ5. PRE IWR OBS: R suspicious
 V043406 ZZ6. PRE IWR OBS: R interest in IW
 V043407 ZZ7. PRE IWR OBS: R sincere
 V043408 ZZ8. PRE IWR OBS: places where doubted R sincerity
 V043409 ZZ9. PRE IWR OBS: R seem to report income accurately

V043409a ZZ10. PRE IWR OBS: est of family income
 V043410 ZZ11. PRE IWR OBS: R age estimate
 V043411 ZZ11a. PRE IWR OBS: R gender
 V043412 ZZ12. PRE IWR OBS: R education estimate
 V043413a ZZ13a.. PRE IWR OBS: Mention 1 - R reactions to IW
 V043413b ZZ13b. PRE IWR OBS: Mention 2 - R reactions to IW
 V043413c ZZ13c. PRE IWR OBS: Mention 3 - R reactions to IW
 V043413d ZZ13d. PRE IWR OBS: Mention 4 - R reactions to IW
 V043413e ZZ13e. PRE IWR OBS: Mention 5 - R reactions to IW
 V043413f ZZ13f. PRE IWR OBS: Mention 6 - R reactions to IW
 V043413g ZZ13g. PRE IWR OBS: Mention 7 - R reactions to IW

POST-ELECTION FIELD AND ADMINISTRATION

V044001 PostAdmin.1. Form of interview
 V044002 PostAdmin.2. Post IW beginning month
 V044003 PostAdmin.3. Post IW beginning day
 V044004 PostAdmin.4. Post IW beginning date MMDD
 V044005 PostAdmin.5. Post IW beginning version of instrument
 V044006 PostAdmin.6. Post IW ending month
 V044007 PostAdmin.7. Post IW ending day
 V044008 PostAdmin.8. Post IW ending date MMDD
 V044009 PostAdmin.9. Post IW ending version of instrument
 V044010a PostAdmin.10a. No. days after election beginning IW date
 V044010b PostAdmin.10b. No. days after election ending IW date
 V044011 PostAdmin.11. Total number of Post interview sessions
 V044012 PostAdmin.12. Post instrument version changed before IW end
 V044013 PostAdmin.13. Total number of Post interviewers
 V044014a PostAdmin.14a. Post IW session 1 date MMDD
 V044014b PostAdmin.14b. Post IW session 2 date MMDD
 V044014c PostAdmin.14c. Post IW session 3 date MMDD
 V044015a PostAdmin.15a. Post IW session 1 version of instrument
 V044015b PostAdmin.15b. Post IW session 2 version of instrument
 V044015c PostAdmin.15c. Post IW session 3 version of instrument
 V044016a PostAdmin.16a. Post IW session 1 breakoff/end
 V044016b PostAdmin.16b. Post IW session 2 breakoff/end
 V044017 PostAdmin.17. Total number of calls
 V044018 PostAdmin.18. Number of FTF calls
 V044019 PostAdmin.19. Number of phone calls
 V044020 PostAdmin.20. Interviewer interview number (nth IW)
 V044021 PostAdmin.21. Refusal conversion indicator
 V044022 PostAdmin.22. Post non-interview result date (MMDD)
 V044023 PostAdmin.23. Mode of interview
 V044024 PostAdmin.24. Result
 V044025 PostAdmin.25. Length of interview
 V044026 PostAdmin.26. Language of interview
 V044027 PostAdmin.27. Interview verification
 V044028 PostAdmin.28. Interviewer evaluation
 V044029 PostAdmin.29. Interview tape-recorded
 V044030 PostAdmin.30. Payment offer amount
 V044031 PostAdmin.31. Payment amount
 V044032 PostAdmin.32. Payment date
 V044033 PostAdmin.33. Payment mode
 V044034 PostAdmin.34 Respondent incentive
 V044035 PostAdmin.35. Persuasion letters
 V044036a PostAdmin.36x1a. Summary: R made positive comment
 V044036b PostAdmin.36x1b. Summary: R made time-delay comment
 V044036c PostAdmin.36x1c. Summary: R made negative comment
 V044036d PostAdmin.36x1d. Summary: R made eligibility comment
 V044036e PostAdmin.36x1e. Summary: R made privacy comment

V044036f PostAdmin.36xlf. Summary: R made comment no int in politics
 V044037a PostAdmin.37a. Comment: positive - help community
 V044037b PostAdmin.37b. Comment: positive - enjoy surveys
 V044037c PostAdmin.37c. Comment: other positive
 V044037d PostAdmin.37d. Comment: time delay - too busy
 V044037e PostAdmin.37e. Comment: time delay - bad time
 V044037f PostAdmin.37f. Comment: time delay - think about it
 V044037g PostAdmin.37g. Comment: other time delay
 V044037h PostAdmin.37h. Comment: negative - waste of time
 V044037j PostAdmin.37j. Comment: negative - don't trust surveys
 V044037k PostAdmin.37k. Comment: negative - surveys waste money
 V044037m PostAdmin.37m. Comment: negative - never do surveys
 V044037n PostAdmin.37n. Comment: negative - not interested
 V044037p PostAdmin.37p. Comment: other negative
 V044037q PostAdmin.37q. Comment: eligibility-don't know about topic
 V044037r PostAdmin.37r. Comment: eligibility -no spouse/partn/child
 V044037s PostAdmin.37s. Comment: eligibility - too young/too old
 V044037t PostAdmin.37t. Comment: eligibility - don't/can't vote
 V044037u PostAdmin.37u. Comment: other eligibility
 V044037v PostAdmin.37v. Comment: privacy - personal questions
 V044037w PostAdmin.37w. Comment: privacy - govt knows everything
 V044037y PostAdmin.37y. Comment: other privacy
 V044038 PostAdmin.38. Respondent initial refusal
 V044039 PostAdmin.39. Informant initial refusal

POST-ELECTION INTERVIEWER DESCRIPTION

V044101 PostIwr.1. Interviewer of record ID
 V044101a PostIwr.1a. Other interviewer ID
 V044102 PostIwr.2. Supervisor ID
 V044103 PostIwr.3. Interviewer gender
 V044104 PostIwr.4. Interviewer education level
 V044105 PostIwr.5. Interviewer race
 V044106 PostIwr.6. Interviewer ethnicity
 V044107 PostIwr.7. Interviewer languages
 V044108 PostIwr.8. Interviewer experience
 V044109 PostIwr.9. Interviewer age group

POST-ELECTION ERROR FLAGS

V044201 PostErr.1. Post interview error flag

POST-ELECTION RANDOMIZATION

V044401 PostRand.1. Order of D1b-c Pres candidate thermometers
 V044402a PostRand.2a. Order of D1d Democratic House cand thermometer
 V044402b PostRand.2b. Order of D1e Republican House cand thermometer
 V044402c PostRand.2c. Order of D1f Ind/3rd party House cand therm
 V044402d PostRand.2d. Order of D1g retiring House incumbent therm
 V044403a PostRand.3a. Order of D1h Democratic Senate cand thermometer
 V044403b PostRand.3b. Order of D1j Republican Senate cand thermometer
 V044403c PostRand.3c. Order of D1k Ind/3rd party Senate cand therm
 V044403d PostRand.3d. Order of D1m Senator #1 thermometer
 V044403e PostRand.3e. Order of D1n Senator #2 thermometer
 V044403f PostRand.3f. Order of D1p Senator term not up thermometer
 V044404a PostRand.4a. Order of D2a Hispanics thermometer
 V044404b PostRand.4b. Order of D2b Christian fundamentalists therm
 V044404c PostRand.4c. Order of D2c Catholics thermometer
 V044404d PostRand.4d. Order of D2d feminists thermometer
 V044404e PostRand.4e. Order of D2e Federal government thermometer

V044404f PostRand.4f. Order of D2f Jews thermometer
 V044404g PostRand.4g. Order of D2g Liberals thermometer
 V044404h PostRand.4h. Order of D2h middle class people thermometer
 V044404j PostRand.4j. Order of D2j labor unions thermometer
 V044404k PostRand.4k. Order of D2k poor people thermometer
 V044404m PostRand.4m. Order of D2m the military thermometer
 V044404n PostRand.4n. Order of D2n big business thermometer
 V044404p PostRand.4p. Order of D2p people on welfare thermometer
 V044404q PostRand.4q. Order of D2q conservatives thermometer
 V044404r PostRand.4r. Order of D2r working class people thermometer
 V044404s PostRand.4s. Order of D2s the elderly thermometer
 V044404t PostRand.4t. Order of D2t environmentalists thermometer
 V044404u PostRand.4u. Order of D2u US Supreme Court thermometer
 V044404v PostRand.4v. Order of D2v gay men and lesbians thermometer
 V044404w PostRand.4w. Order of D2w Asian Americans thermometer
 V044404y PostRand.4y. Order of D2y Congress thermometer
 V044404z PostRand.4z. Order of D2z blacks thermometer
 V044405a PostRand.5a. Order of D2aa southerners thermometer
 V044405b PostRand.5b. Order of D2ab men thermometer
 V044405c PostRand.5c. Order of D2ac young people thermometer
 V044405d PostRand.5d. Order of D2ad illegal immigrants thermometer
 V044405e PostRand.5e. Order of D2ae rich people thermometer
 V044405f PostRand.5f. Order of D2af women thermometer
 V044405g PostRand.5g. Order of D2ag business people thermometer
 V044405h PostRand.5h. Order of D2ah Catholic church thermometer
 V044405j PostRand.5j. Order of D2aj whites thermometer
 V044405k PostRand.5k. Order of D2ak Israel thermometer
 V044405m PostRand.5m. Order of D2am Muslims thermometer
 V044406a PostRand.6a. Order of F1a prevent nuclear weapons goal
 V044406b PostRand.6b. Order of F1b promote human rights goal
 V044406c PostRand.6c. Order of F1c strengthen U.N. goal
 V044406d PostRand.6d. Order of F1d combat world hunger goal
 V044406e PostRand.6e. Order of F1e protect US jobs goal
 V044406f PostRand.6f. Order of F1f promote democracy goal
 V044406g PostRand.6g. Order of F1g control illegal immigration goal
 V044406h PostRand.6h. Order of F1h promote market economies goal
 V044406j PostRand.6j. Order of F1j combat intl terrorism goal
 V044407 PostRand.7. Order of G4b-c House cand lib-cons placement
 V044408 PostRand.8. Order of G5b-c House cand spending-serv placemt
 V044409 PostRand.9. Order of G6b-c Pres cand interventionism placemt
 V044410 PostRand.10. Order of G6d-e Hse cand interventionism placemt
 V044411 PostRand.11. Order of G6f-g party interventionism placemt
 V044412 PostRand.12. Order of G7b-c Pres cand abortion placement
 V044413 PostRand.13. Order of G7d-e Hse cand abortion placement
 V044414 PostRand.14. Order of G7f-g party abortion placement
 V044415a PostRand.15a. Order of P4b blacks hardworking scale
 V044415b PostRand.15b. Order of P4c Hispanics hardworking scale
 V044415c PostRand.15c. Order of P4d Asian-Americans hardworking scale
 V044416a PostRand.16a. Order of P5b blacks intelligent scale
 V044416b PostRand.16b. Order of P5c Hispanics intelligent scale
 V044416c PostRand.16c. Order of P5d Asian-Americans intelligent scale
 V044417a PostRand.17a. Order of P6b blacks trustworthy scale
 V044417b PostRand.17b. Order of P6c Asian-Americans trustworthy scale
 V044417c PostRand.17c. Order of P6d Hispanics trustworthy scale

POST-ELECTION CANDIDATES

V044501 Cand.1. State and congressional district of IW
 V044502 Cand.2. Type of House race
 V044503a Cand.3a. U.S. House Democratic candidate name

V044503b Cand.3b. U.S. House Democratic candidate code
 V044503c Cand.3c. U.S. House Democratic candidate gender
 V044504a Cand.4. U.S. House Republican candidate name
 V044504b Cand.4b. U.S. House Republican candidate code
 V044504c Cand.4c. U.S. House Republican candidate gender
 V044505a Cand.5. U.S. House independent/third party candidate name
 V044505b Cand.5b. U.S. House independent/third party candidate code
 V044505c Cand.5c. U.S. House independent/third party cand gender
 V044505d Cand.5d. U.S. House independent/third party cand party
 V044506a Cand.6. U.S. House retiring incumbent name
 V044506b Cand.6b. U.S. House retiring incumbent code
 V044506c Cand.6c. U.S. House retiring incumbent gender
 V044507 Cand.7. Type of Senate race
 V044508a Cand.8a. U.S. Senate Democratic candidate name
 V044508b Cand.8b. U.S. Senate Democratic candidate code
 V044508c Cand.8c. U.S. Senate Democratic candidate gender
 V044509a Cand.9. U.S. Senate Republican candidate name
 V044509b Cand.9b. U.S. Senate Republican candidate code
 V044509c Cand.9c. U.S. Senate Republican candidate gender
 V044510a Cand.10. U.S. Senate independent/third party cand name
 V044510b Cand.10b. U.S. Senate independent/third party cand code
 V044510c Cand.10c. U.S. Senate independent/third party cand gender
 V044510d Cand.10d. U.S. Senate independent/third party cand party
 V044511a Cand.11a. U.S. Senator term not up (state with race) name
 V044511b Cand.11b. U.S. Senator term not up (state with race) code
 V044511c Cand.11c. U.S. Senator term not up (state with race) gender
 V044512a Cand.12a. U.S. Senator #1 (state without race) name
 V044512b Cand.12b. U.S. Senator #1 (state without race) code
 V044512c Cand.12c. U.S. Senator #1 (state without race) gender
 V044513a Cand.13a. U.S. Senator #2 (state without race) name
 V044513b Cand.13b. U.S. Senator #2 (state without race) code
 V044513c Cand.13c. U.S. Senator #2 (state without race) gender
 V044514a Cand.14a. Winner Party U.S. House race
 V044514b Cand.14b. Winner Cand code U.S. House race
 V044515a Cand.15a. Percent Incumbent House candidate
 V044515b Cand.15b. Percent Democratic House candidate
 V044515c Cand.15c. Percent Republican House candidate
 V044515d Cand.15d. Percent Ind/3rd-party House candidate
 V044516a Cand.16a. Winner Party U.S. Senate race
 V044516b Cand.16b. Winner Cand code U.S. Senate race
 V044517a Cand.17a. Percent Incumbent Senate candidate
 V044517b Cand.17b. Percent Democratic Senate candidate
 V044517c Cand.17c. Percent Republican Senate candidate
 V044517d Cand.17d. Percent Ind/3rd-party House candidate

POST-ELECTION SURVEY

V045001 A1. How interested in political campaigns
 V045002 A2. Did R watch programs about campaign on TV
 V045002a A2a. Watched how many programs about campaign on TV
 V045003 A3. How many days in past week watched TV news
 V045003a A4. How much attention to news on TV about Pres campaign
 V045004 A5. Did R read about campaign in any magazines
 V045004a A5a. How much atten to Pres campaign articles in magazines
 V045005 A6. R listen to campaign speeches or discussions on radio
 V045005a A6a. How many campaign speeches or discussions on radio
 V045006 A7. How much attention to Pres campaign news in general
 V045007 A8. How much of the time trust media to report news fairly
 V045008 B1. Mobilization: anyone from political parties contact R
 V045008a B1a. Mobilization: which political party contacted R

V045009 B2. Mobilization: anyone other than parties contacted R
 V045010 B3. Campaign: R try to influence vote of others
 V045011 B4. Campaign: R go to campaign meetings, rallies, speeches
 V045012 B5. Campaign: R display campaign button/sticker/sign
 V045013 B6. Campaign: R do any other campaign work for party/cand
 V045014 B7. Contributions: R contribute to candidate
 V045014a B7a. Contributions: party of candidate R contributed to
 V045015 B8. Contributions: Did R give money to party
 V045015a B8a. Contributions: which party did R give money to
 V045016 B9. Did R give money to other group for/against cand/party
 V045017a C1a. Did R vote (standard version)
 V045017b C1b. Did R vote (experimental version)
 V045018 C2. Nonvoter: registered to vote in this election
 V045018x C3. Summary: vote and registration status
 V045019 C4. Is R registered in county of residence
 V045019a C4a. State where registered if outside county of residence
 V045019b C4b. County where registered if outside county of resid
 V045019c C4c. Voter: state-distr where regist outside county of resid
 V045020x C4x. Summary: voter registration in/out of county
 V045021x C4x1. Voter summary: state of registr same as state of IW?
 V045022x C4x2. Voter summary: distr of registr same as distr of IW?
 V045023 C5. Did R vote on election day or before
 V045023a C5a. How long before election R voted
 V045024 C5a1. Did R vote in person or by absentee ballot
 V045025 C6. Voter: did R vote for President
 V045026 C6a. Voter: R's vote for President
 V045026a C6a1. Voter: preference strength for Pres cand of vote
 V045027 C6b. Voter: how long before election decision on Pres vote
 V045028 C6c. Nonvoter: any preference for President
 V045029 C6c1. Nonvoter: what preference for President
 V045029a C6c2. Nonvoter: strength of preference for President
 V045030x C6x. Summary: voter type
 V045031x C7bx. Summary: Did R vote for House of Representatives
 V045032x C7bx1. Summary: vote for party House of Representatives
 V045033x C7bx2. Summary: vote for cand House of Representatives
 V045034 C7c. Nonvoter: did R prefer US House candidate
 V045035 C7c. Nonvoter: what US House candidate R preferred
 V045035x C7dx. Nonvoter: cand code US House preference
 V045036x C7x. Summary: Senate race and voter status
 V045037x C8bx. Summary: Did R vote for Senate
 V045038x C8bx1. Summary: vote for party in Senate race
 V045039x C8bx2. Summary: vote for cand in Senate race
 V045040 C8c. Nonvoter: did R prefer US Senate candidate
 V045041 C8c1. Nonvoter: what US Senate candidate R preferred
 V045041x C8c2. Nonvoter: cand code US Senate preference
 V045042 C9. How fair was November election
 V045043 D1a. Feeling Thermometer: GW Bush
 V045044 D1b. Feeling Thermometer: John Kerry
 V045045 D1c. Feeling Thermometer: Ralph Nader
 V045046 D1d. Feeling Thermometer: Democratic House cand
 V045047 D1e. Feeling Thermometer: Republican House cand
 V045048 D1f. Feeling Thermometer: Ind/3rd party House cand
 V045049 D1g. Feeling Thermometer: Retiring incumbent
 V045050 D1h. Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Senate cand
 V045051 D1j. Feeling Thermometer: Republican Senate cand
 V045052 D1k. Feeling Thermometer: Ind/Third Party Senate cand
 V045053 D1m. Feeling Thermometer: Senator #1 in state with no race
 V045054 D1n. Feeling Thermometer: Senator #2 in state with no race
 V045055 D1p. Feeling Thermometer: Senator not up - state with race
 V045056 D2a. Feeling Thermometer: Hispanics (Hispanic-Americans)

V045057 D2b. Feeling Thermometer: Christian Fundamentalists
 V045058 D2c. Feeling Thermometer: Catholics
 V045059 D2d. Feeling Thermometer: Feminists
 V045060 D2e. Feeling Thermometer: Federal Government in Washington
 V045061 D2f. Feeling Thermometer: Jews
 V045062 D2g. Feeling Thermometer: Liberals
 V045063 D2h. Feeling Thermometer - middle class people
 V045064 D2j. Feeling Thermometer: Labor Unions
 V045065 D2k. Feeling Thermometer: Poor people
 V045066 D2m. Feeling Thermometer: The Military
 V045067 D2n. Feeling Thermometer: Big Business
 V045068 D2p. Feeling Thermometer: People on welfare
 V045069 D2q. Feeling Thermometer: Conservatives
 V045070 D2r. Feeling Thermometer: working class people
 V045071 D2s. Feeling Thermometer: Older people (the elderly)
 V045072 D2t. Feeling Thermometer: environmentalists
 V045073 D2u. Feeling Thermometer: U.S. Supreme Court
 V045074 D2v. Feeling Thermometer: Gay Men and Lesbians
 V045075 D2w. Feeling Thermometer: Asian Americans
 V045076 D2y. Feeling Thermometer: Congress
 V045077 D2z. Feeling Thermometer: Blacks
 V045078 D2aa. Feeling Thermometer - Southerners
 V045079 D2ab. Feeling Thermometer - men
 V045080 D2ac. Feeling Thermometer - young people
 V045081 D2ad. Feeling Thermometer - illegal immigrants
 V045082 D2ae. Feeling Thermometer - rich people
 V045083 D2af. Feeling Thermometer - women
 V045084 D2ag. Feeling Thermometer - business people
 V045085 D2ah. Feeling Thermometer - the Catholic Church
 V045086 D2aj. Feeling Thermometer: Whites
 V045087 D2ak. Feeling Thermometer: Israel
 V045088 D2am. Feeling Thermometer: Muslims
 V045089 E1a. Which party had most members in House prior to electn
 V045090 E1b. Which party had most members in Senate prior to elect
 V045091 E1x. Summary: type of House incumbent
 V045092 E2. Does R approve/disapprove House incumbent job
 V045092a E2a. How strongly R approves/disapproves House incumbent
 V045093 E3a. How often has House incumbent supported President
 V045094 E3b. How well house incumbent keeps in touch with district
 V045095 E4. How often R follows govt and public affairs
 V045096 E5a. Favor incr budget deficit to increase domestic spendg
 V045097 E5b. Favor increasing budget deficit to cut taxes
 V045098 E5c. Favor reduc spendg on domestic programs to cut taxes
 V045099 F1a. US foreign policy goal: preventing spread of nuclear
 V045100 F1b. US foreign policy goal: promote human rights
 V045101 F1c. US foreign policy goal: strengthen United Nations
 V045102 F1d. US foreign policy goal: combating world hunger
 V045103 F1e. US foreign policy goal: protect jobs of American wkrs
 V045104 F1f. US foreign policy goal: promote democracy
 V045105 F1g. US foreign policy goal: control illegal immigration
 V045106 F1h. US foreign policy goal: promote market economies abrd
 V045107 F1j. US foreign policy goal: combat intl terrorism
 V045108 F2. How important is it for US to have strong military
 V045109 F3. Have opinion - govt see to fair employmt for blacks
 V045109a F3a. Should government see to fair employment for blacks?
 V045109b F3a1. Strength feels govt should/shd not see to fair empl
 V045110 G1a. Favor reduc domestic spend progs to cut budg deficit
 V045111 G1b. Favor increasing taxes to cut budget deficit
 V045112 G1c. Favor incr taxes to increase domestic spending progs
 V045113 G2a. Change in gap between rich and poor in last 20 yrs

V045113a G2a1. How much change in gap between rich and poor
 V045113b G2b. Is change in gap between rich and poor good or bad
 V045114 G3. Favor or oppose limits on foreign imports
 V045115 G3a. Should immigration be increased, decreased, stay same
 V045116 G3b. Effect of Hispanic immigration: take jobs away
 V045117 G4a. Liberal/conservative 7-point scale: self-placement
 V045117a G4a1. If R had to choose lib-con self-placement
 V045118 G4ax. Summary: liberal-conservative self-placement
 V045119 G4b. Liberal/conservative 7-point scale: US House Dem cand
 V045120 G4c. Liberal/conservative 7-point scale: US House Rep cand
 V045121 G5a. Services/spending tradeoff 7-pt scale: self-placement
 V045122 G5b. Services/spending tradeoff 7-pt scale: Dem House cand
 V045123 G5c. Services/spending tradeoff 7-pt scale: Rep House cand
 V045124 G6a. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: self-placement
 V045125 G6a1. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: importance
 V045126 G6b. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: GW Bush
 V045127 G6c. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: John Kerry
 V045128 G6d. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: Dem House cand
 V045129 G6e. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: Rep House cand
 V045130 G6f. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: Dem party
 V045131 G6g. Interventionism by diplomacy/military: Rep party
 V045132 G7a. Abortion position: self-placement
 V045133 G7a1. Importance of abortion issue to R
 V045134 G7b. Abortion position: GW Bush
 V045135 G7c. Abortion position: John Kerry
 V045136 G7d. Abortion position: Dem House candidate
 V045137 G7e. Abortion position: Rep House candidate
 V045138 G7f. Abortion position: Dem party
 V045139 G7g. Abortion position: Rep party
 V045140 H1a. R position on aid to Hispanic-Americans scale
 V045141 H1b. How important is issue of aid to Hispanic-Americans
 V045142 H2. What should federal govt do about outsourcing
 V045142a H2a. How much should govt discourage/encourage outsourcing
 V045143 H3. Favor allowing Social Sec funds invested in the market
 V045143a H3a. Strength favor/oppose investing Soc Sec funds in mkt
 V045143b H3b. Summary: favor/oppose investing Soc Sec funds
 V045144 H4. Does R favor/oppose school vouchers
 V045144a H4a. How strongly does R favor/oppose school vouchers
 V045145 H5. How good does seeing US flag make R feel
 V045145x H5x. Summary: Pre-Post US flag makes R feel
 V045146 H6. Things about America that make R ashamed
 V045146x H6x. Summary: Pre-Post America makes ashamed
 V045147 H7. Things about America that make R angry
 V045147x H7x. Summary: Pre-Post America makes angry
 V045148 H8. How strong is love for country
 V045148x H8x. Summary: Pre-Post how strong love for country
 V045149 H9. How important is being an American
 V045149x H9x. Summary: Pre-Post importance of being American
 V045150 J1a. Limit Government: problems have become bigger
 V045151 J1b. Limit Government: need strong govt for complex probs
 V045152 J1c. Limit Government: less government the better
 V045153 J2. Does R ever talk politics with family and friends
 V045153a J2a. How many days in past week R discussed politics
 V045154 J3. Does R listen to political talk radio
 V045155 J3a. Does R have access to the internet or web
 V045155a J3b. Did R see any information about campaign on Web
 V045156 J4a. Should laws protect homosexuals against job discrim
 V045156a J4a1. Strength favor/oppose laws to protect homosexuals
 V045157 J4b. Should homosexuals serve in U.S. armed forces
 V045157a J4b1. Strength favor/oppose homosexuals in military

V045158 J4c. Should homosexual couples be allowed to adopt
 V045159 J5a. Important differences between Democrats and Repubs
 V045160 J5b. Is one party is more conservative at national level
 V045160a J5b1. Which party is more conservative at national level
 V045161 J6a. R have interest in equal treatment for women in jobs
 V045161a J6b. R opinion on equal treatment for women in jobs
 V045161b J6c. Strength opinion on equal treatment for women in jobs
 V045162 J7a. Politl knowledge office recognition Dennis Hastert
 V045162a J7a1. PROBE used for recognition of Hastert
 V045163 J7b. Political knowledge office recognition Dick Cheney
 V045163a J7b1. PROBE used for recognition of Cheney
 V045164 J7c. Political knowledge office recognition Tony Blair
 V045164a J7c1. PROBE used for recognition of Blair
 V045165 J7d. Political knowledge office recognition Wm Rehnquist
 V045165a J7d1. PROBE used for recognition of Rehnquist
 V045166 J8a. R worked/joined organization on community problem
 V045167 J8b. Contacted public official to express views
 V045168 J8c. Attended community meeting about issue
 V045169 J8d. R taken part in Protest or march in last year
 V045170 J9a. Is R a member of any organizations
 V045170a J9a1. Number of organizations R is a member of
 V045171 J10. Able to devote time to volunteer work in last 12 mo
 V045172 J11. In last 12 mos, made contributions of money to church
 V045173 K0. Summary: R gender/race/ethnicity status
 V045174 K1. Is R linked to what happens with women
 V045174a K1a. How much R linked to what happens to women
 V045175 K1b. R feeling pride in accomplishments of women
 V045176 K1c. R angry about the way women are treated in society
 V045177 K2. Is R linked to what happens to blacks
 V045177a K2a. How much R linked to what happens with blacks
 V045178 K2b. R feeling pride in accomplishments of blacks
 V045179 K2c. R angry about the way blacks are treated in society
 V045180 K3. Is R linked to what happens to Hispanics
 V045180a K3a. How much R linked to what happens with Hispanics
 V045181 K3b. R feeling pride in accomplishments of Hispanics
 V045182 K3c. R angry about the way Hispanics treated in society
 V045183 K4a. Women demanding equality seek special favors
 V045184 K4b. Women miss good jobs because of discrimination
 V045185 K4c. Women complaining abt harassment cause problems
 V045186 L1. Would R say most people can be trusted
 V045187 L2. Would people try to take advantage of R
 V045188 L3. Most people try to be helpful or look out for selves
 V045189 L4a. Should adjust moral views to changing world
 V045190 L4b. Newer lifestyles causing society breakdown
 V045191 L4c. Should be more tolerant of different moral standards
 V045192 L4d. Should be more emphasis on traditional family ties
 V045193 L5a. Blacks should work their way up like other groups
 V045194 L5b. History makes more difficult for blacks to succeed
 V045195 L5c. Blacks gotten less than they deserve
 V045196 L5d. Blacks should try harder to succeed
 V045197 M1a. How often trust government in Washington to do right
 V045198 M1b. Is govt run by few big interests or benefit of all
 V045199 M1c. How much does government waste tax money
 V045200 M1d. How many crooked people running government
 V045201 M2a. Public officials don't care what people think
 V045202 M2b. People like me don't have any say in what govt does
 V045203 M3a. How much attention does govt pay to what people think
 V045204 M3b. Elections make govt pay attn to what people think
 V045205 M4a. Working mother can have warm relationship with kids
 V045206 M4b. Better if woman cares for home-family and man achieve

V045207 M5a. R for or against preference for blacks in jobs
 V045207a M5b. Strength R favors/opposes preference for blacks in jobs
 V045208 N1a. Qualities for children: Independent or respect elders
 V045209 N1b. Qualities for children: Curiosity or good manners
 V045210 N1c. Qualities for children: Obedience or self-reliance
 V045211 N1d. Qualities for children: Considerate or well behaved
 V045212 N2a. Should do what is necessary for equal opportunity
 V045213 N2b. Have gone too far pushing equal rights
 V045214 N2c. Big problem is not giving everyone equal chance
 V045215 N2d. Better off if worried less about equality
 V045216 N2e. Not that big a problem if people have unequal chance
 V045217 N2f. Many fewer problems if people treated equally
 V045218 P1a. How opinionated is R
 V045219 P1b. R have fewer or more opinions than average
 V045219a P1c. R have many or somewhat fewer/more opinions
 V045220 P2a. Does R like responsibility for thinking
 V045220a P2b. How much R likes/dislikes responsibility for thinking
 V045221 P3. Does R like simple or complex problems
 V045222 P4a. Hardworking 7-pt scale: whites
 V045223 P4b. Hardworking 7-pt scale: blacks
 V045224 P4c. Hardworking 7-pt scale: Hispanic-Americans
 V045225 P4d. Hardworking 7-pt scale: Asian-Americans
 V045226 P5a. Intelligent 7-pt scale: whites
 V045227 P5b. Intelligent 7-pt scale: blacks
 V045228 P5c. Intelligent 7-pt scale: Hispanic-Americans
 V045229 P5d. Intelligent 7-pt scale: Asian-Americans
 V045230 P6a. Trustworthy 7-pt scale: whites
 V045231 P6b. Trustworthy 7-pt scale: blacks
 V045232 P6c. Trustworthy 7-pt scale: Hispanic-Americans
 V045233 P6d. Trustworthy 7-pt scale: Asian-Americans
 V045235 Q1a. CSES Did R talk to others to persuade how to vote
 V045235a Q1a1. CSES How often R talked to others about how to vote
 V045236 Q2. CSES Did R attend meeting, etc. for party or candidate
 V045236a Q2a. CSES How often R attended meeting etc. for party/cand
 V045237 Q3. CSES Did candidate or party contact R about vote
 V045238 Q4. CSES Most important issue in past 4 years
 V045239 Q4a. CSES How well has govt done on most imp issue
 V045240 Q5. CSES How good job in general govt has done past 4 yrs
 V045241 Q6. CSES How satisfied with democracy in US
 V045242 Q7. CSES Makes a difference who is in power
 V045243 Q8. CSES Who people vote for makes a difference
 V045244 Q9. CSES Democracy is best form of govt
 V045245 Q9x. Interviewer checkpoint - party of vote
 V045246 Q9a. CSES Party of Pres vote -party performance past 4 yrs
 V045247 Q10. CSES Elections ensure voters views are represented
 V045248 Q11. CSES Does any party represent Rs views
 V045248a Q11a. CSES Which party represents R's views
 V045249 Q12. CSES Does any 2004 Pres cand represent R views
 V045249a Q12a. CSES Which cand in last election represents R views
 V045250 Q13. CSES R think of self as close to any party
 V045250a Q13a1. CSES Mention 1 party R thinks of self as close to
 V045250b Q13a2. CSES Mention 2 party R thinks of self as close to
 V045251 Q13a0. CSES IWR checkpoint: number of parties R close to
 V045252 Q13a1. CSES Which party R feels closest to among multiple
 V045253 Q13b. CSES Is R a little closer to one party than others
 V045253a Q13b1. CSES If a little closer to one party, which one
 V045254 Q13x. CSES Summary: most close party
 V045255 Q14. CSES How close to this party
 V045257 Q15. CSES Like/dislike scale - Democratic Party
 V045258 Q16. CSES Like/dislike scale - Republican Party

V045259 Q17. CSES Like/dislike scale - Reform party
 V045260 Q19. CSES Left-right scale - Democratic Party
 V045261 Q20. CSES Left-right scale - Republican Party
 V045262 Q21. CSES Left-right scale - Reform party
 V045263 Q22. CSES Left-right scale - GW Bush
 V045264 Q23. CSES Left-right scale - John Kerry
 V045265 Q24. CSES Left-right scale - Ralph Nader
 V045266 Q25a. CSES Has R contacted politician or govt official
 V045267 Q25b. CSES Has R taken part in protest or demonstration
 V045268 Q25c. CSES Has R worked with others on shared concern
 V045269 Q27a. CSES How much respect for human rights in US
 V045270 Q27b. CSES How much corruption in US
 V045271 Q28. CSES Left-Right scale - self placement

POST-ELECTION INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION

V045300a Z1a. Flag Terminology Left-Right
 V045300b Z1b. Flag Terminology Liberal-Conservative
 V045301a ZZ1a. POST IWR obs: others present - children under 6
 V045301b ZZ1b. POST IWR obs: others present - older children
 V045301c ZZ1c. POST IWR obs: others present - spouse
 V045301d ZZ1d. POST IWR obs: others present - other relatives
 V045301e ZZ1e. POST IWR obs: others present - other adults
 V045301f ZZ1f. POST IWR obs: others present - someone, not sure who
 V045302 ZZ2. POST IWR OBS: R cooperation
 V045303 ZZ3. POST IWR OBS: R level of information
 V045304 ZZ4. POST IWR OBS: R intelligence
 V045305 ZZ5. POST IWR OBS: R suspicious
 V045306 ZZ6. POST IWR OBS: R interest in IW
 V045307 ZZ7. POST IWR OBS: R sincere
 V045307a ZZ7a. POST IWR OBS: places where doubted R sincerity
 V045308a ZZ8a. POST IWR OBS: Mention 1 - R reactions to IW
 V045308b ZZ8b. POST IWR OBS: Mention 2 - R reactions to IW
 V045308c ZZ8c. POST IWR OBS: Mention 3 - R reactions to IW
 V045308d ZZ8d. POST IWR OBS: Mention 4 - R reactions to IW
 V045308e ZZ8e. POST IWR OBS: Mention 5 - R reactions to IW
 V045308f ZZ8f. POST IWR OBS: Mention 6 - R reactions to IW
 V045308g ZZ8g. POST IWR OBS: Mention 7 - R reactions to IW